

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

Volume XXXVII OCTOBER 1942

Number 4

ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝ ΚΥΚΝΟΣ

ALEXANDER H. KRAPPE

KYKNOS was a king of the Ligurians who ruled at the mouth of the amber-producing Eridanos. He was a friend of Phaëthon, and at the misfortune which befell that imprudent young man he was so stricken with grief that the gods transformed him into a swan. In this shape he chanted his dying song.

This brief and somewhat pathetic story is probably best known from Vergil's lines (*Aen.* x. 189 ff.):

Namque ferunt luctu Cyenum Phaethontis amati
populeas inter frondes umbramque sororum
dum canit et maestum musa solatur amorem,
canentem molli pluma duxisse senectam
linquentem terras et sidera voce sequentem.

It is, however, much older, going back to Hesiod, whose account has been preserved by Hyginus (*fab.* 154). In Alexandrian times it was retold by Phanocles, on whose work Ovid drew for his own account.¹ The commentator on Vergil, Servius (*ad Aen.* x. 189), adds that Kyknos had been endowed with the gift of song by Apollon and that the gods, not satisfied with transforming him into a bird, further honored him by raising him to the nightly sky, where he forms the constellation ever since known by his name. Pausanias (x. 30. 3) is silent

¹ *Narr. ad Ovid. Met.* ii. 367 (p. 797 [Stad.]); Lactant. *Argum. in Ovid. Metam.* 2; cf. A. Couat, *Alexandrian Poetry under the First Three Ptolemies* (London, 1931), p. 107; Karl Müllenhoff, *Deutsche Altertumskunde*, I (Berlin, 1890), 218; A. B. Cook, *Zeus*, II (1925), 477.

about Phaëthon but relates that Kyknos, a musician, became king of the Ligurians inhabiting the Celtic country beyond the Eridanos and at his death was transformed into a swan by Apollon.

The first problem requiring a solution is the reason responsible for the connection of Kyknos with Phaëthon. The fact that Hyginus quotes Hesiod as his authority affords, of course, no guaranty that Hesiod was his *only* source,² and the association of the two heroes may possibly be later. Whether or no we believe it as early as Hesiod, it certainly is secondary. Our suspicion is aroused chiefly by the strange accumulation of transformations connected with Phaëthon's fall: we are told first that Phaëthon's sisters, the Heliades, were transformed into amber-exuding white poplars (λευκαί);³ then Kyknos is metamorphosed into a swan. Even the motivation is the same: an act of divine mercy, since Phaëthon's sisters, as well as his friend, are grief-stricken and inconsolable at their loss. But we know that attraction has always been a powerful factor in the formation of cycles or clusters of myths, and the conclusion is probably not far wrong that the metamorphosis of the Heliades attracted that of Kyknos into the orbit of the Phaëthon cycle.

Still, to explain such an attraction, it ought to be shown that the two stories shared some other feature which facilitated the process, and this feature appears to be the geographical location of the two. The Heliades were transformed into poplars growing on the banks of the Eridanos. But the Eridanos was also the river famous for its singing swans, as we know from one of Lucian's witty dialogues.⁴ After inquiring into the amber-weeping poplars—with a negative result—Lucian puts a second question to the boatmen, his informants:

But how about your swans? At what time do they sing so melodiously, ranged along the river, on this side and on that? People say, at all events, that they were associates of Apollo, men with the gift of song, who somewhere in these parts changed into birds, and for that reason do not forget their music, but still continue to sing.

² Cf. C. Robert, *Hermes*, XVIII (1883), 436 f.

³ Ovid *Metam.* ii. 363 ff.; Eur. *Hippol.* 732 ff.; Apollon. Rhod. iv. 602 ff.; Paus. i. 4. 1; Diod. Sic. v. 23. 2 ff.; cf. also Cook, *op. cit.*, pp. 472 ff.; Apollodorus, *The Library*, ed. Frazer (London, 1921), II, 388 ff.; G. Knaack, *Quaestiones Phaethontaeae* ("Philologische Untersuchungen," Vol. VIII [Berlin, 1886]), pp. 62 f.

⁴ On *Amber* 4-5; cf. also Pliny *NH* x. 63; Athen. ix. 393 D; Aelian *Var. hist.* i. 14; v. 2.

Alas, the information elicited was even more disappointing:

We are always on the water [said they] and have worked on the Eridanos since we were children, almost; now and then we see a few swans in the marshes by the river, and they have a very unmusical and feeble croak; crows and daws are Sirens to them. As for the sweet song you speak of, we never heard it or even dreamt of it, so we wonder how these stories about us got to your people.

Lucian was, of course, quite right from his point of view. The river which he (following many others) took to be the Eridanos was the Po, and the only swans his informants knew were evidently specimens of the mute swan (*Cygnus olor*), whose croak is anything but melodious.

The real Eridanos was, however, not (and never had been) the Po or any other river emptying into the Mediterranean basin, in which, besides, no amber is found. In prehistoric times the amber reaching the Mediterranean is known to have come from the North Sea coast, up the river Elbe, whence it followed the valleys of the Saale or Moldau, to cross the Alps at the Brenner Pass to the mouths of the Adige and the Po.⁵ This led to vague reports concerning a large river which emptied into the northern ocean near the amber isles.⁶ This river was known as the Eridanos.⁷

A few words about this mysterious river may be useful. As is generally known, the Greeks were shut off from the outer sea by the sea power of Carthage, which jealously guarded the secret of the northern tin and amber routes. As a result, the Eridanos came to be identified with the rivers through whose mouths the amber finally reached the Mediterranean, that is, the Po and the Rhone.⁸ Inasmuch as the older

⁵ Cf. R. Hennig, *Neue Jahrbücher f. d. kl. Altertum*, XLIX (1922), 365; *Von rätselhaften Ländern* (München, 1925), pp. 85 f.; H. Schaal, *Vom Tauschhandel zum Welt-handel* (Leipzig, 1931), p. 19; E. Norden, *Alt-Germanien* (Leipzig-Berlin, 1934), p. 258, n. 3; Sir William Ridgeway, *The Early Age of Greece*, I (Cambridge, 1901), 182; for a good map cf. Cook, *op. cit.*, Pl. XXVI. The thesis of the otherwise excellent work of G.-E. Broche (*Pythéas le Massaliote* [Paris, 1935], pp. 204 ff.), namely, that the proto-historic amber is of Baltic origin, is untenable in view of the results of a chemical analysis of this amber.

⁶ Apollon. Rhod. iv. 505 f.

⁷ 'Ερεδανός is, of course, a good Greek or rather pre-Hellenic name, since it occurs in the old Attic genealogies (cf. Wilamowitz, *Hermes*, XVIII [1883], 427, n. 2). On the Attic river by that name cf. Strabo ix. 1. 19; Paus. i. 19. 6.

⁸ Müllenhoff, *op. cit.*, I, 219 f.; A. Bertrand and S. Reinach, *Les Celtes dans les vallées du Pô et du Danube* (Paris, 1894), pp. 10 and 18. The strange phenomenon of earlier writers' being better informed than later ones, on matters geographical, is not unique. Familiar instances of this are seen in the false notion of the Caspian entertained by

accounts leave no doubt about the fact that the Eridanos was thought to empty into the outer ocean,⁹ these late identifications are, of course, inadmissible; and Karl Müllenhoff, in the last century, believed the Eridanos to have been the Rhine.¹⁰ There are grave objections to this identification, set forth by R. Hennig, who, following Olshausen,¹¹ pointed out that the Eridanos was none other than the river Elbe, while the amber isles must be sought in the Frisian archipelago.¹² This identification is now quite generally accepted.

We thus find this northern river closely associated (1) with amber and (2) with swans. The question arises: Do these swans correspond to the description applied to Kyknos, whose musical endowments are stressed in the accounts outlined above, and to the expectations of Lucian?

Antiquity had a good deal to say about the singing swan. From the account of Hecataeus of Abdera, who wrote toward the end of the fourth century of the pre-Christian era, we learn that there lived, on a certain island of the Far North, called Helioxioia, a people that worshipped Apollon in a round temple. The god used to come to this island at regular intervals, giving the signal for choral services at the spring equinox, when wild swans would come down from the Rhipaeon Mountains, joining their notes harmoniously with the human voices.¹³ The tradition of the singing swan is, however, much older. In Plato's *Phaedo* (84 E), Socrates asks Simmias whether he really thinks him inferior in prophetic power to the swans or less able than they to greet the unseen with a song. As early as the eighth century of the pre-Christian era the author of the *Shield of Heracles*, wrongly attributed to Hesiod, seems to speak of an island in the northwestern ocean characterized by a multitude of singing swans.¹⁴ Then there is the hymn of

Strabo and the opposite error in regard to the Indian Sea held by Ptolemy, as compared with the correct ideas on both subjects possessed by Herodotus.

⁹ Herod. iii. 115.

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 221; cf. H. D'Arbois de Jubainville, *Les premiers habitants de l'Europe* (Paris, 1894), II, 28.

¹¹ *Zeitschrift f. Ethnologie*, XXII (1890), 270.

¹² *Neue Jahrbücher*, XLIX, 364 ff.; *Von rätselhaften Ländern*, pp. 82 ff.

¹³ Diod. Sic. ii. 48; Aelian *De nat. anim.* xi. 1.

¹⁴ Vss. 315-17:

οἱ δὲ κατ' αὐτὸν
κύκνοι ἀερσιπύται μεγάλ' ἤπνουν οἱ δὲ ῥά τε πολλοὶ
νήχον ἐπ' ἄκρον ὕδωρ· παρὰ δ' ἵχθεις ἐκλονέοντο.

Alcaeus telling how Apollon is given by his father Zeus a swan-drawn chariot and how the god bids these swans, instead of going to Delphi, as Zeus would have had him do, fly to the land of the Hyperboreans.¹⁵ In Euripides' *Phaëthon* the bird of Apollon is described as singing a morning hymn on the waves of the Ocean that girds the earth.¹⁶

The swan referred to is the whooper swan (*C. musicus* or *ferus*)—a species entirely distinct from the mute swan (*C. olor*). The whooper swan is a migratory bird of virtually unvarying habits. A native of Iceland, Spitzbergen, eastern Lapland, and northern Russia, that is, of countries generally well within the Arctic Circle, it flies southward in autumn to return to its northern home in March or April. In its southward flight it visits the British Isles, western and central Europe, Italy, and the Balkans. In Germany it has been observed in the valley of the Elbe, particularly in the famous park of Wörlitz in the former Duchy of Anhalt.¹⁷

The song of this swan has a strange melancholy sound, faintly resembling distant bells, sometimes loud enough to disturb in their sleep those who are not used to it.

The bird was known in Greece and western Asia Minor in Homeric times, as is shown by a well-known passage of the *Iliad* (ii. 459 ff.); but on the whole it is much less common in the Mediterranean countries than the mute swan, and this accounts for the skepticism of Lucian. At all events the swans of the amber country were singing swans, and Kyknos was transformed into a bird of this species. The common occurrence of this swan along the amber coast of northwestern Germany no doubt accounts for the linking of the transformation of Kyknos to that of the Heliades.

This result, it must be admitted, has been attained by inferences rather than on direct statements by existing documents. There is, however, one fact which strikingly confirms our deductions. Kyknos is said to have been a king of the Ligurians. But we know that Ligu-

¹⁵ Ἀλκαίου Μέλη, ed. Edgar Lobel (Oxford, 1927), pp. 42 f.; cf. K. O. Müller, *Die Dörfer* (Breslau, 1844), I, 271; Cook, *op. cit.*, pp. 459 f.

¹⁶ Wilamowitz, *op. cit.*, pp. 402 f.

¹⁷ Müllenhoff, *op. cit.*, I, 1 ff.; O. Keller, *Die antike Tierwelt*, II (Leipzig, 1913), pp. 213 ff.; R. G. Wardlaw Ramsay, *Guide to the Birds of Europe and North Africa* (London, 1923), p. 213; J. Rendel Harris, *Bull. John Rylands Library*, IX (1925), 375 ff.; Hennig, *Historische Zeitschrift*, CXXXIX (1928), 17 f.; J. Hoops, *Wörter und Sachen*, XII (1929), 252.

rian tribes, prior to the advent of the Celts, i.e., in the first half of the first millennium before Christ, inhabited the North Sea coast between the Maas and the Elbe, as well as parts of Belgium and northern France.¹⁸ The statement would thus appear to reflect geographical and ethnological data of a very early period, antedating the settlement of the Celts in northwestern Europe. It goes far to prove the essential correctness of our identification of the amber isles with the Frisian archipelago.

The same fact would also seem to betray a very early authority and to strengthen Robert's view as to the correctness of Hyginus' citation. The statement of Theophrastus¹⁹ to the effect that amber was found in Liguria can be explained only on the supposition that his source was some account based on a geographical and ethnographical map of Europe true for the eighth century of the pre-Christian era but certainly no longer true in the fourth.

Pausanias is the only authority to ascribe the transformation of Kyknos into a whooper swan to the god Apollon. His statement cannot very well be separated from a passage in Servius' Vergil commentary, according to which it was Apollon who had conferred upon Kyknos the gift of song.²⁰ Thus the question arises: What has Apollon to do in all this? It will not do, of course, to hold the story of Phaëthon responsible: Phaëthon was a son of Helios, not of Apollon, and there is nothing to indicate a possible identity of the two.²¹ There remain three other clues, viz., Apollon's connection with (1) the swan, (2) amber, and (3) the Frisian North Sea coast.

Apollon is definitely connected with the whooper swan in the account of the Hyperborean land given by Hecataeus of Abdera, in the hymn of Alcaeus, and in Euripides' *Phaëthon*, all referred to above, to say nothing of iconography (since in their outward appearance *C. musicus* and *C. olor* are hardly differentiated).

¹⁸ D'Arbois, *op. cit.*, II, 205; Henri Hubert, *The Rise of the Celts* (London, 1934), p. 152.

¹⁹ *De lapid.* 16 (ed. Schneider).

²⁰ *Op. et loc. cit.*: "Fuit enim quidam Ligus Cynus nomine dulcedine cantus ab Apolline donatus amator Phaëthontis, qui cum eum flet extinctum longo luctu in avem sui nominis versus est, qui postea ab Apolline inter sidera conlocatus est."

²¹ Aeschylus (*Sept. Theb.* 859) appears to have been the first to identify Apollon with the sun.

Apollon's connection with amber is no less certain. Apollonius Rhodius knew a Celtic tradition, according to which amber drops are the tears of the god when he had been banished by Zeus to the land of the Hyperboreans.²² In a study to be published shortly in *Speculum* it has been pointed out that the votive offerings sent to Delos by the Hyperboreans were probably the first fruits of the "amber season," which opened, as we learn from Pytheas of Massilia, quoted by Pliny,²³ shortly after the equinoctial storms—a conjecture made nearly a century ago by F. G. Welcker.²⁴

The center of the amber-fishing, according to Pytheas' account, was an island of the Frisian archipelago (*Glaesariae*) known as *Abalus* (or *Abalum*), a name which seems to survive in *Habel* and *Appelland*, two of the Halligen Islands off the west coast of Schleswig-Holstein, or in *Avlum*, on Thy, on the west coast of Jutland.²⁵ It is difficult to separate this tradition from the report of Hecataeus of Abdera concerning the mysterious island of Helioxoia, where Apollon was worshiped in a round temple and where whooper swans, swooping down from the northern mountains, announced his presence. For it is certainly no accident that one of the most important stations in the southward migration of these birds is precisely the isle of Helgoland, at the mouth of the river Elbe, the ancient Eridanos. To quote a well-known bird specialist:

Countless multitudes of all sorts of species are seen speeding towards all parts, and in all directions, in companies great and small, solitary and in pairs. Indeed I have known days on which I have seen, far as the eye could reach, in all quarters of the sky, swarms of these birds crossing each other in all directions; and more astonishing still, on looking upward, have beheld above me a teeming multitude, so thick that the highest swarms presented the appearance of scarcely discernible clouds of dust. . . . Nowhere does the quick observant eye find rest. Suddenly are heard—first faintly, then in

²² *Arg.* iv. 611 ff.

²³ *NH* xxxvii. 35–36; cf. also iv. 94–95, 97, 103; xxxvii. 42; Diod. Sic. v. 23; D'Arbois de Jubainville, *Revue celtique*, XII (1891), 13 f., and *Cours de littérature celtique*, XII (Paris, 1902), 72 f.; D. Detlefsen, *Die Entdeckung des germanischen Nordens im Altertum* (Berlin, 1904), pp. 4 ff.

²⁴ *Griechische Götterlehre* (Göttingen, 1857–62), II, 353 ff. As late as the sixth century of our era Cassiodorus (*Var.* v. 2) reports that a certain northern tribe had sent amber as an offering to the great Theodoric; cf. also Hennig, *Historische Zeitschrift*, CXXXIX, 25 ff.

²⁵ Broche, *op. cit.*, p. 219.

increasing loudness—sounds like distant trumpet blasts, and once more our eyes are attracted upwards, where a long chain of Whooper Swans, eighteen or twenty in number, in snow-white plumage, calmly pursue their way with measured beating of their wings.²⁶

And again:

This swan occurs here more or less numerous every winter, being most frequently seen during the long-continued frost; on such occasions it is not uncommon to see flights of ten, twenty, or even much larger numbers migrating high overhead in a long row one behind the other, uttering loud trumpet calls as they pass along.

There are two difficulties in the way of any attempt to identify Helgoland outright with the island of Hecataeus, viz., (1) the Greek writer asserts that the island is as large as Sicily, while Xenophon of Lampascus, as quoted by Pliny,²⁷ likewise speaks of the immense size of the amber island; (2) Plutarch, who also knows of a god exiled to an island in the northern ocean, called Kronos by him but doubtless identical with the exiled Apollon of Apollonius Rhodius,²⁸ states that on that island the sun disappears only for a short time from the horizon during thirty days in the year; but this would presuppose a higher latitude than that of Helgoland. As for the first difficulty, it is to be noted that Helgoland is known to have been much larger formerly, having been reduced in size by the action of the waves.²⁹ It is also known that most data referring to distances in the north are greatly exaggerated, owing no doubt to the slow progress made by Mediterranean vessels in the northern seas with their strong tides.³⁰ At all events, since there never has been an island of vast size anywhere in this region or even farther north, we must assume that the ancient authors erroneously transferred data referring to Britain³¹ or Scandinavia (long considered an island)³² to the mysterious isle of the Hyperborean Apollon.³³ This would also take care of the second difficulty.

²⁶ H. Gätke, *Heligoland: An Ornithological Observatory* (London, 1895), pp. 21 f. and 519.

²⁷ *NH* iv. 95; cf. Detlefsen, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

²⁸ Plutarch *De facie in orbe lunae* 26; cf. *De defectu orac.* 18.

²⁹ G. Hergt, *Die Nordlandfahrt des Pytheas* (diss. Halle-Wittenberg, 1893), p. 34; Hennig, *Von rätselhaften Ländern*, p. 90.

³⁰ Detlefsen, *op. cit.*, p. 6; Hennig, *Von rätselhaften Ländern*, p. 109.

³¹ It is noteworthy that Britain, like Sicily, was thought (not incorrectly) to be triangular (cf. Diod. Sic. v. 21).

³² Pliny *NH* iv. 27 and 30; Jord. 3.

³³ Harris, *op. cit.*, pp. 381 and 390 f.

Hecataeus of Abdera and Apollonius Rhodius are by no means the only or the earliest writers of antiquity who definitely associate Apollon with the far north. Pindar gives a glowing description of a Nordic land of bliss, an inaccessible island ruled over by Apollon:

Neither by ship nor by land canst thou find the wondrous road to the trysting place of the Hyperboreans. . . . In the banquets and praises of that people Apollon chiefly rejoiceth . . . neither sickness nor baneful eld mingleth among that chosen people; but, aloof from toil and conflict, they dwell afar from the wrath of Nemesis. . . .³⁴

Strabo has preserved the fragment of a lost play of Sophocles dealing, presumably, with the rape of Oreithyia by Boreas:

Let us therefore pass over . . . what Sophocles, speaking of Oreithyia in one of his tragedies, says, that she, being snatched by the northwind, was carried

"Over the whole ocean, to the extremities of the earth,
Even to the place where night receiveth its birth,
Where the opposite side of the heavens is beheld,
And where is situated the ancient garden of Phoebus."³⁵

To this isle of bliss Apollon carried his favorite heroes. Thus Bacchylides (3. 53) relates how the god releases the good king Croesus from the burning pyre, wafting him to the Hyperboreans in reward for his piety.³⁶ In Pindar's ode, referred to above, the inference is that King Hiero of Syracuse, to whom it is dedicated, will ultimately enjoy the same blissful fate.³⁷

If these Hellenic traditions are founded on fact, we should expect that the island in question would have left an analogous reputation, or traces of such, in the traditions of the north. Such is indeed the case. *Helgoland* means nothing less than "holy island," a name fully justified, inasmuch as the island was the center of the cult of the Frisian god Foseti, who may be supposed to have taken the place of a Celtic predecessor, and was avoided by pirates down into the Middle

³⁴ *Pyth.* x. 27 ff.; cf. also Wilamowitz, *Pindaros* (Berlin, 1922), pp. 127 f.

³⁵ vii. 3. 1; Nauck, *Frag. trag. Gr.*, p. 333:

ὑπὲρ τε πόντον πάντ' ἐπ' ἔσχατα χθονός
νυκτός τε πηγὰς οὐρανοῦ τ' ἀναπτυχάς
Φοίβου τε παλαιὸν κῆπον. . . .

³⁶ O. Crusius, *Philologus*, LVII (1898), 155 f.; Körte, *Archiv f. Religionswissenschaft*, X (1907), 152.

³⁷ H. Jurenka, *Philologus*, LIX (1900), 313 ff.

Ages.³⁸ In these circumstances the Greek form of the name given to the mysterious island at the time of Alexander the Great (when Teutonic tribes had undoubtedly reached the North Sea coast), *Helioxoia*, may very well resolve itself into corruptions of *helig*, "holy," and *ey*, "island," an etymology not unacceptable, perhaps, at least until a better shall have been found.³⁹

The facts reviewed will leave no doubt about the very definite relations of Apollon with the amber coast of northwestern Germany. He shares with Kyknos his connection with the whooper swan, with amber, and with the North Sea coast and the Frisian archipelago, and his introduction into the transformation story of Kyknos would thus appear natural enough.

What is striking, however, is the strange parallelism between the god and the hero; for, apart from the three features just mentioned, Kyknos shares with Apollon the gift of song, which the god is stated to have conferred upon his favorite. In other words, there is nothing (apart from the transformation proper) that Kyknos does not share with Apollon. This fact would seem to warrant the inference that Kyknos is merely the heroic form of Apollon; but this inference would imply that the god transformed himself into a whooper swan, that he was a swan himself; for, according to the well-known law first formulated, I believe, by Salomon Reinach, the shape assumed by a god in a metamorphosis story is merely the former animal form of the same god, and the myths of Zeus as a bull (in the rape of Europa), of Io as a cow, and of Artemis as a she-bear will readily come to mind.

On the other hand, it is clear that such a divinity can have been conceived only in a country where the whooper swan was of common occurrence, which means that Hesiod's localization of the tale among the Ligurians of the North Sea coast of Germany or Holland presupposes the worship of Apollon Kyknos by those peoples. In other words, Apollon Kyknos is a northerner, whose home is the northwestern part of central Europe.

Here one objection might be raised. If the foregoing inferences are justified, how are we to explain, on Greek soil, the connection of the swan with divinities other than Apollon? Thus in a well-known Pello-

³⁸ Adamus Brem. iv. 3.

³⁹ Harris, *op. cit.*, p. 382.

ponnesian tradition it is Zeus who assumes the shape of a swan in order to seduce Leda and to beget the Spartan Dioskouroi.

To this objection we may point out that a number of Apollon's functions and epithets are occasionally found attributed to Zeus. Thus the Anatolian sun-god Syros or Lykos is not only the predecessor of Apollon Lykeios but also of Zeus Lykaeos.⁴⁰ The Nordic Kyknos may therefore very well have been identified, in the Peloponnesus, with the Olympian Zeus.

This conjecture would seem to be borne out by the following rather significant circumstance. *Leda*, Dor. *Lada*, cannot be separated from *Leto*, Dor. *Lato* (whence the Lat. *Latona*). The word is generally thought to be the equivalent of Gr. γυνή, "woman," and the goddess would then be the Woman par excellence. But, by this very *Leto*, Zeus is the father of another pair of twin-gods, Apollon and Artemis, which would lead us back to the Swan Apollon.

The relationship of Apollon and Artemis is known to be secondary; but the original and Indo-European, i.e., Nordic, character of the Spartan Dioskouroi has been known for some time, and their Sanskrit, Persian, Teutonic, and Celtic equivalents have been studied repeatedly.⁴¹

Da muss sich manches Rätsel lösen—
Doch manches Rätsel knüpft sich auch,

says Goethe, who knew what true research means. Several questions may, indeed, already have presented themselves to the mind of the reader.

The strange idea of localizing an earthly paradise of the type described by Pindar and Sophocles in the dreary Frisian archipelago will certainly require some explanation.

The ancients were quite aware of the true nature of amber, which is a resinous product.⁴² Thus the *Collection of Marvelous Stories* as-

⁴⁰ Detailed proof of this has been presented in my study "Apollon," in *Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni* (Rome). On the Apolline character of the story of Zeus, Leda, and the Swan cf. M. Mayer, *Die Giganten und Titanen in der antiken Sage und Kunst* (Berlin, 1887), pp. 80, 141 f.

⁴¹ For a comprehensive bibliography cf. my book *Mythologie universelle* (Paris, 1930), p. 100; *Acta philologica Scandinavica*, VI (1931), 1-25.

⁴² Cf. Arist. *Meteor.* iv. 10. 10, ed. Didot; Pliny *NH* xxxvii. 42; Tacitus *Germ.* 45; Martial iv. 59. 1 f.; Pauly-Wissowa, *R.-E.*, Vol. III (1), col. 297.

cribed to Aristotle and written about 300 B.C. describes amber as a gum which liquefied from poplars near the Eridanos and which, being hardened into the consistency of stone, was collected by the natives and exported into Greece.⁴³ What was less generally known was its fossil nature, though the geographer Philemon pointed this out.⁴⁴ As a rule it was assumed that amber was exuded from living trees growing on islands of the northern ocean. Thus, according to Pliny, Mithridates reported that on the coast of Germany⁴⁵ there was an island called *Serita*, grown with cedars exuding resin. In other words, the islands near which amber was fished from the sea became, in the imagination of the Mediterranean peoples, islands overgrown with amber trees.

The Mediterraneans were, however, neither the first nor the only ones thus to account for the valued product. The Germans were no less aware of the true nature of amber, as is sufficiently proved by MLG *glar*, "resin," as compared with OE *glær*, "amber."⁴⁶ Knowing, then, that amber was not a marine product, they answered the question as to its origin by the assumption that it was the resin of trees growing on some island or continent beyond the sea, whence it was washed to the German shores. Since to the poor barbarians who inhabited northwestern Germany amber was about as valuable as gold is to us, this assumption quite naturally led to the belief in an island paradise, a sort of Eldorado. In other words, the mysterious northern isle owed its splendid reputation to the simple fact that it was an amber isle.

If such is the case, one may reasonably expect this tradition to have left traces also in the north; for in the eyes of the barbarians who sold

⁴³ *Mir. ausc.* 81.

⁴⁴ Pliny *NH* xxxvii. 33: "Philemon fossile esse (electrum dixit)."

⁴⁵ *Ibid.* xxxvii. 39. To be sure, Mayhoff (in the Teubner ed. [1906]) adopts the reading "in Carmaniae litoribus insulam esse quam vocari Seritam, cedri genere silvosam"; but the compiler of the Index, s.v. *Serita*, locates the island in *Germaniae litore*, accepting the reading of the Codex Leidensis (which reads *germanicae*), as did the translators of the English version published by the Bohn Classical Library. In Carmania (on the Persian Gulf) no amber is known to have been found. Mithridates Eupator—for he is the author referred to (cf. F. Susemihl, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur in der Alexandrinerzeit* [Leipzig, 1891–92], II, 415)—was in a position, as ruler over what is now southern Russia, to have some information about northern Europe.

⁴⁶ R. Much, *Zeitschrift f. deutsches Altertum*, LXI (1924), 101.

the precious substance the island was bound to have at least as much glamor as in those of the far-off Greeks. This conclusion is borne out by a number of facts. Certain Scandinavian documents, discussed in detail in my article to be published in *Speculum*, speak of a terrestrial paradise called *Glaesisvellir* or *Glaesisvollum*, names evidently derived from OG *glez*, "amber," Lat. *glæsum*. At the gates of Walholl is a grove named *Glasi*r, i.e., evidently, a grove of amber trees. Celtic traditions know of an *insula vitrea*, OFr *isle de voirre*, which in the Middle Ages meant "glass island" but which originally meant "amber isle," owing to the semantic development of the word *glæsum*, "amber," in the Teutonic and Celtic languages: OG *glez*, OE *glæ*r, "amber," MG, ME *glass*; Ir. *glain*, *gloin*, "glass," "crystal"; Welsh *glein*, *glain*, "gemma," "tessera." Lastly, the name of the amber island *Abalus* (or *Abalum*) mentioned by Pytheas of Massilia survives not only in the names of two Hallig islands, *Habel* and *Appelland*, and the name of *Avlum* in western Jutland but also in that of the Celtic *Avallon*, the island paradise to which King Arthur is wafted, according to Arthurian tradition, much as Croesus and Hiero are wafted, at least in the verses of Bacchylides and Pindar, to the island paradise of the Hyperborean Apollon. This island of *Avallon*, on the other hand, is identical with the *insula vitrea*, the ancient amber isle, which, in the Middle Ages, had become a "glass island."

The report of an amber isle in the northern ocean might be regarded as a simple geographical myth which might be supposed to have reached Greece, as geographical myths usually reach distant countries, by the route of commerce—in this case the amber trade. Such a theory would fail to explain (1) the tradition of the votive offerings sent down by the Hyperboreans, i.e., the tribes of the amber coast, (2) the connection of the Hellenic Apollon with the whooper swan and the myth which formed the starting-point of this study, and (3) the consistent connection of the Hellenic Apollon with the north and with amber. All these peculiarities are explained quite satisfactorily by the assumption that the Hellenic Apollon himself had his home in north-western Germany and that he was carried into the Balkans by some migratory northern tribe, which doubtless followed much the same route as the Celts of Brennus in the fourth century before Christ and Alaric's Goths in the fourth century after Christ. This would also ex-

plain the decidedly Nordic appearance of the god, which has been pointed out repeatedly.⁴⁷

Many of the most bitter controversies concerning the nature and origin of Apollon could have been avoided, had it been realized that the Apollon of the classical epoch is as much of a compound as was the Hellenic nation itself. Thus Apollon Smintheus, the "Mouse Apollon," was recently shown to be a Mysian tribal divinity of east European origin, introduced into the Troad by the invading Mysians in pre-Homeric times and identified with Apollon, though by no means with Apollon only.⁴⁸ Apollon Lykeios is, as Wilamowitz⁴⁹ rightly conjectured, an Anatolian and pre-Hellenic sun-god, called *Syros*, *Lykos*, or (in southern Italy) *Soranus*.⁵⁰ Neither of these can reasonably be supposed to be responsible for the god's classical name, Ἀπόλλων, voc. Ἀπολλων, Delph. Dor. Ἀπελλων.⁵¹ There remains, then, the possibility that it was Kyknos, the "Swan Apollon," who provided the name for the compound divinity as we know it.

It should be noted, in the first place, that the memory of the original identity of the Hellenic and the north European god would probably not have been preserved, as it was, down to Alexandrian times, had a similarity of their names not favored it. In the second place, the resemblance of the name of the amber isle, *Abalus*, Celt. *Avallon*, to the name of the Greek god, whose paradise and sacred property that isle was fabled to be, can hardly be a mere chance. So we are led to inquire into the meaning of that name.

Abalus, as the MG names for the two Frisian islands of *Habel* and *Appelland* clearly indicate, meant the "apple isle." It might be noted,

⁴⁷ J. L. Myres, *Who Were the Greeks?* (Berkeley, Calif., 1930), pp. 193 and 568, n. 63; H. R. Hall, *The Ancient History of the Near East* (London, 1913), p. 520, n. 1; cf. also my *Mythologie universelle*, p. 262; Gilbert Murray, *Four Stages of Greek Religion* (New York, 1912), p. 69.

⁴⁸ *CP*, XXXVI (1941), 133-41.

⁴⁹ *Hermes*, XXXVIII (1903), 575-86; *Greek Historical Writing and Apollo* (Oxford, 1908), pp. 27 ff.

⁵⁰ Cf. a study of mine forthcoming in *Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni* (Rome) (cf. above, n. 40).

⁵¹ As E. Meyer (*Geschichte des Altertums*, I, Abt. II [Stuttgart-Berlin, 1909], 640) pointed out, the Lycians rendered the name Ἀπολλωνίδης by *Pulenida*, i.e., by a borrowing from the Greek, which would be difficult to understand if the Anatolians had had a name of their own corresponding to the Hellenic Ἀπόλλων.

in passing, that there also is an isle called *Ebelō* in the Danish waters, northeast of the Little Belt.⁵² Similarly, the Celtic *Avallon* is obviously connected with Welsh *afal*, Bret. Corn. *aval*, O. Ir. *abhall*, from which O. Celt. **ab-allo-s* may be inferred. The medieval Latin texts usually render it by *Insula Pomorum*. On the other hand, the Hellenic Apollon has curious connections with the apple tree and its fruit.⁵³

There are, first, two cult titles of Apollon pointing to the apple (μήλον): Apollon Μαλεάτης (from μαλέα, "apple tree"), a formation parallel with Dionysos Συκεάτης (from συκέα, "fig"),⁵⁴ and Apollon Μαλοεῖς, occurring in an inscription from Lesbos⁵⁵ and in a Thucydides scholion, which tells an amusing story about the origin of the name.⁵⁶ In Lucian's *Anacharsis* 9 Solon explains that the prizes in athletic contests are: "At Olympia a wreath of wild olive, at the Isthmus one of pine, at Nemea of parsley, at Pytho *some of the god's sacred apples*." This statement is corroborated by a Delphian coin showing the apples on the victor's table.⁵⁷ In the sacred grove of Apollon near Klazomenai, known as the Grynaean grove, there was an apple tree which on one occasion was the object of a dispute between the seers Mopsus and Calchas, as to which of the two could divine correctly the number of apples on that tree.⁵⁸

Joining these facts to the consistent association of the Celtic Apollon with apples and apple orchards and adding the Greek statements which tacitly identify the Nordic and the Hellenic Apollon, we are led to conclude that the two are one and that Apollon was from the beginning the god of the apple tree. The vocative "Απολλον Delph. Dor. "Απελλον represents the original form of the name, as has repeatedly been suspected,⁵⁹ and it is a cognate of the Celtic and Teutonic names

⁵² Broche, *op. cit.*, p. 211.

⁵³ Rendel Harris, *The Ascent of Olympus* (Manchester, 1917), pp. 36 ff.; cf. also B. F. C. Atkinson, *Bull. John Rylands Library*, VII (1922), 138-40; Cook, *op. cit.*, 487 ff.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 37 f.

⁵⁵ *IG*, XII, 2, 484; cf. Harris, *op. cit.*, pp. 37 and 42.

⁵⁶ Cf. *Revue de philologie*, I (1877), 185; cf. also Steph. Byz., s.v. Μαλλοεῖς [sic], drawing on the Λεσβικά of Hellanicus.

⁵⁷ Harris, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

⁵⁸ *Myth. Vat.*, I, 194; Serv. in *Verg. Ecl.* 6. 72; cf. Harris, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

⁵⁹ Cf. A. Nehring, *Mitteilungen d. schlesischen Gesellschaft f. Volkskunde*, XVIII (1916), 23; cf. also the Thessalian form "Απλον (F. Bechtel, *Die griechischen Dialekte* [Berlin, 1921], I, 172).

of the tree and its fruit. The god and the tree thus stand in exactly the same relation as the Gr. Πόρκος (later Φόρκυς) and the oak (Lat. *quercus*).⁶⁰

Let us now see what light philology may throw on the history of the apple. The word is common to the Celtic, Teutonic, and Slavonic languages; but the IE languages of southern Europe have different names for the fruit, though Lat. *malum* is probably derived from the Greek (Ion. Att. μήλον, Dor. μάλον).⁶¹ On the analogy of a considerable number of other fruit names derived from the Latin, it has been frequently assumed that the Celtic and Teutonic forms may go back to some Latin designation such as *malum abellanum*, from the town of *Abella*, now Avella Vecchia, in Campania,⁶² which was famous for its fine apples, as may be seen from Vergil's verse (*Aen.* vii. 740):

Et quos maliferae despectant moenia Abellae.

What militates against this derivation is the regularity with which the Celtic, Teutonic, and Lithuanian forms obey the sound laws—a rare phenomenon in loan-words. The borrowing would have to antedate the first Teutonic sound-shift⁶³ and antedate by far the period when we may reasonably suppose the apples of Abella to have acquired their well-deserved reputation. On the other hand, the name of *Abella* is not the oldest name of the town, which is said to have originally been named *Moera*.⁶⁴ Accordingly, Schrader, who at first had shared the traditional view, later arrived at the conclusion that Abella is named after the fruit,⁶⁵ a view shared also by Johannes Hoops⁶⁶ and R. Much.⁶⁷

⁶⁰ *Revue archéologique*, XXXVI (5th ser., 1932), 87 ff.

⁶¹ O. Schrader, *Real-Lexikon*, I, 53; V. Hehn, *Kulturpflanzen und Haustiere* (Berlin, 1911), pp. 627 f.

⁶² Schrader, *op. cit.*, I, 53; Hehn, *op. cit.*, p. 627. The hypothesis is as old as Cormac's *Glossary*; cf. Hoops, *Waldbäume und Kulturpflanzen im germanischen Altertum* (Strassburg, 1905), p. 478.

⁶³ Schrader, *Prehistoric Antiquities of the Indo-Germanic Family* (London, 1890), p. 276.

⁶⁴ Serv. in *Verg. Aen.* vii. 740; cf. J. Beloch, *Campanien* (Breslau, 1890), p. 411. Hubert (*op. cit.*, p. 57) aptly suggests that the name of the town tends to show that the Italian peoples once had the word and subsequently lost it.

⁶⁵ *Real-Lexikon*, I, 53.

⁶⁶ *Op. cit.*, pp. 477 ff.

⁶⁷ *Zeitschrift f. österreichische Gymnasien*, XLVII (1896), 608.

Abella is simply one of the many apple towns scattered all over the map of Europe, from the Fr. *Avallon*, the Eng. *Appledore*, the Dutch *Apeldoorn*, the Ger. *Apolda*, to the Slav. *Jablonka* in the Carpathian Mountains, and even in Palestine: *Tappûah*, from Hebr. *tappûâh*, Arab. *tuffâh* "apple."⁶⁸ The evidence therefore points to the fruit's having been carried down into the southern peninsulas of Europe by invading northern tribes; and it is natural enough that the god of the apple tree, Apollon, accompanied the fruit. This accounts for the consistent association of the god with the fruit and with a garden or orchard of the type described in the verses of Pindar and Sophocles.

There remains one problem. The amber isle of Apollon was called *Abalus* or *Abalum*, later *Avallon*. The trees credited with exuding amber are, however, not apple trees but poplars; the Heliades are transformed into white poplars, not into apple trees. To this still another difficulty must be added: the poplar is certainly no north or north-central European tree, as its names in the Teutonic and Slavonic languages suffice to show; Eng. *poplar* and Ger. *Pappel* are derived from Lat. *populus*, as are Pol. *topola*, Russ. *topol'*, Croat *topola*, Czech *topola*. The tree was introduced into the countries north of the Alps in Roman times and even later.⁶⁹ Thus the amber-exuding trees on the banks of the Eridanos cannot have been poplars. So we ask next: If not poplars, what were they?

Light is thrown on the subject by a Croat word for "poplar," synonymous with *topola*, to wit, *jablan*,⁷⁰ a word evidently related to Russ. *yabloko*, Pol. *jablko*, Bulg. *yabuka*, Czech *jablko*, "apple." In the Middle Ages the Serbo-Croat word *jablan* still had the meaning of "apple tree."⁷¹

Now it is a well-known fact that similar shifts in the meaning of tree names have been noted frequently. An excellent modern example is the Ger. *Buche*, which generally denotes the beech (*Fagus silvatica*) but which also designates the hornbeam (*Carpinus betulus*), an alto-

⁶⁸ For a partial list of these cf. Harris, *JHS*, XLV (1925), 236 ff.

⁶⁹ H. M. Willkomm, *Forstliche Flora von Deutschland und Oesterreich* (Leipzig, 1887), pp. 519 f., 530; Hoops, *op. cit.*, pp. 230 f.

⁷⁰ F. A. Bogadek, *New English-Croatian and Croatian-English Dictionary* (Pittsburgh, 1926), s.v.

⁷¹ E. Berneker, *Slavisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg, 1908-13), I, 23.

gether different tree. The MG *Föhre*, OHG *forhe*, is the common word for the Scotch pine (*Pinus silvatica*), but the word is related to Lat. *quercus*, the name of the Prussian-Lithuanian thunder-god, *Perkunas*, Gr. *Πόρκος* (later *Φόρκυς*); thus it was originally the name of the oak tree. The Eng. *yew*, Welsh *yw* (whence Fr. *if*), and OHG *iwa* (whence NHG *Eibe*) designate a coniferous tree known to botanists as *Taxus*; but the cognate O. Slav. *jiva* means "willow." Again, to Russ. *grab*, *grabina*, Czech *habr*, *hrabr*, and Pol. *grab* (*Carpinus betulus*) appear to correspond Gr. *γράβιον*, "torch," originally, probably, "oak wood," and Umbr. *Grabovius*, a surname of the old Italian oak-god Jupiter.⁷² Variants of the Lat. *carpinus* are Lith. *skiřpstas*, "elm," and *skirpstùs*, "beech."⁷³

The poplar is a south European tree genus. The Illyrians, on first occupying the lands between the Danube and the Adria, are therefore likely to have encountered it for the first time. They did not coin a new term for it but transferred to it their old word denoting the apple tree, without, however, giving up the old meaning of the word. Subsequent generations, no longer aware of the extension in meaning, and, a fortiori, the Greeks, who seem to have learned the traditions of the amber isle from Illyrian intermediaries, were thus led into the error of assuming that the amber-exuding trees were poplars. But it is clear, on this showing, that originally they were apple trees.

To sum up the outstanding results of this inquiry, let us say that to the "Mouse Apollon" and to the Anatolian sun-god must now be added a third component of the classical Apollon, fully as important as the other two: the "Swan Apollon," the god of the whooper swan, of amber, and of the apple tree—a divinity introduced into Greece by invading northern tribes hailing from the amber coast of northwestern Europe.

PRINCETON, N.J.

⁷² N. Jokl, *Wörter und Sachen*, XII (1929), 73.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 75. On shifts in the meaning of tree names cf. also H. Usener, *Götternamen* (Bonn, 1896), p. 202.

STUDIES IN THE ATHENIAN TRIBUTE LISTS. I

STERLING DOW

IN THE *Athenian Tribute Lists*, Volume I,¹ a work which contains much that is sound, we read (p. 133): "Since no tribute was collected in 449/8 B.C., there is no List 6." This statement, printed among the texts themselves and without qualification, as if it were an established fact, needs rephrasing and testing. The sole evidence that no tribute was paid in the year in question is the apparent absence of an inscribed list of quota for that year. In the interest of the non-specialist reader, the statement should perhaps have read: "There appears to be no list for 449/8 (i.e., no List 6), and it is to be inferred that no tribute was collected in that year."

Whatever the wording, the statement involves three propositions: (1) The year in question is 449/8 B.C. and not 447/6 (it is certain and universally agreed that there is no other alternative). The present study is concerned with the choice between these two years. (2) Whichever year it is, there is no room on the First Stele for the list of the year in question. This proposition will be examined in the second study of the present series, which will be published in the next number of *Classical Philology*.² If this second proposition is incorrect, then the third will appear in a different light. (3) The third proposition is that, since no tribute quota was recorded on the First Stele, no tribute was collected in the year in question. One of the editors of *ATL*, B. D. Meritt, had formerly doubted this proposition.³ My own misgivings were merely expressed, not argued;⁴ A. W. Gomme was the first to

¹ By B. D. Meritt, H. T. Wade-Gery, and M. F. McGregor (Cambridge, Mass., 1939); referred to hereinafter as *ATL*.

² The third study is concerned with an independent problem, the assessment of 425/4. It appeared in *TAPA*, LXXII (1941, pub. 1942), 70-84.

³ *Documents on Athenian Tribute* (Cambridge, 1937), p. 69, n. 13; referred to hereinafter as *Docs*.

⁴ *Amer. Jour. Archaeol.*, XLII (1938), 601, in a review of *Docs*; *ibid.*, XLV (1941), 642, in a review of *ATL*.

argue his doubts on all three propositions.⁵ In an excellent semipopular essay Meritt now reverts to his former misgivings on the third proposition; but he provides no argument, and he leaves the other two propositions untouched.⁶

There is another reason for probing into these difficulties. Even if the present studies merely confirmed, let us say, the first two propositions, or even if the problems had to be pronounced unsolvable at present, there would still be some gain from raising questions about method. The editing of the tribute lists involved handling a mass of problems, and it is natural that the actual procedure of the various letter-cutters in laying out and inscribing the texts should not have been explored, either in *ATL*, Volume I, or in earlier studies.⁷ The omission was nevertheless unfortunate. One example will suffice: the drawing in *Docs.*, page 69, Figure 15, even if the text is correct, is wrong in four important particulars, two of them visible at a glance; yet it has escaped criticism. The drawing in question is the drawing which forms the visual basis for proposition (1) as given above and consequently for the history of the Athenian Empire in the years 449/8-447/6. It is regrettable that errors should have crept in just here; conversely, there is hope that the rectification of them will establish some text as definitely preferable.

The starting-point is the small eroded marble which Wade-Gery recently proved⁸ to be a joining fragment of the tribute-quota list *S(upplementum) E(pigraphicum) G(raecum)*, V, 7. With the aid of this new fragment, its discoverer claimed that *SEG*, V, 7 was not a separate and independent tribute-quota list. The text printed as *SEG*, V, 7

⁵ *CR*, LIV (1940), 65-67.

⁶ "Athens and the Delian League," in *The Greek Political Experience: Essays Presented to W. K. Prentice* (Princeton, 1941), p. 53.

⁷ Parts of the present study were drafted before the appearance of R. P. Austin's *Stoichedon Style* (Oxford, 1938). His treatment, which of course is general, gave me nothing specific to add or to alter; but it is pleasant to record that his book not only agrees in the main on the principles, but also affords the best available general account of the subject and that his pp. 54-58 are still the only discussion in print of stoichedon in the tribute lists.

Apart from particular problems, the present paper may interest epigraphists in that it proposes a formal and a practical test of whether any given inscription is stoichedon (below, pp. 374, 378), and discusses the principles of relaxed spacing in last lines (p. 382).

⁸ *British School Annual*, XXXIII (1932/3, pub. 1935), 101-13.

was rather to be divided up, and the two parts were to be assigned to two other tribute-quota lists: accordingly, the actual list in *SEG*, V, 7 of cities and quotas has become part of the list now published as *ATL*, 2 (formerly *SEG*, V, 2), which records tribute-quotas for 453/2; the remaining letters of *SEG*, V, 7—fewer, larger letters, which had naturally been taken to form a heading—were rather, according to Wade-Gery, a postscript of *ATL*, 1 (formerly *SEG*, V, 1), the list for 454/3. These findings have been universally accepted.

By making new readings in the new fragment, Meritt (*Docs.*, pp. 61–65) was able to give a restoration of the postscript with lines of 20 letters each, and it appears thus in *ATL*, 1. Both he and Wade-Gery conceded that by itself the width of the stele permitted lines of 21 letters each. The data are solid, however, and a positive decision between 20 and 21 letters ought to be possible. It can be shown, I think, that no alternative exists, and that Wade-Gery and Meritt were indubitably right when they preferred 20 letters.

This finding will be helpful for the main problem of the present study, which arises from the fact that Wade-Gery's discovery, by eliminating *SEG*, V, 7 as a separate list, has apparently left 449/8 or 447/6 without any list. A choice between these years depends primarily upon the restoration of the prescript of another list, viz., *ATL*, 8 (= *SEG*, V, 8). The determining factor in the restoration of this prescript is again the number of letters per line.

1. THE POSTSCRIPT OF *ATL*, 1

The first text (*ATL*, Vol. I, p. 129), the newly identified postscript of 454/3, is of 13 lines, including some 259 letters. Having so many letters to deal with, the mason would naturally be inclined to reckon carefully, so as to keep his inscription within an exactly calculated space. To do this, he would inevitably lay out a stoichedon plan and would stick to it. The beginnings of 8 lines are preserved, and they are in fact strictly stoichedon as far as they now exist. Meritt has shown that 9 lines can be plausibly restored with 20 letters to a line (*Docs.*, p. 63). Lines 1 and 2 are restored in skeleton form. Of the other two lines, line 9 cannot be completed, and line 13 contained 19 letters and a 1-space *vacat*. Meritt's assumption that the scheme was stoichedon throughout (except perhaps for numerals in line 9) is

strengthened by the above observation on how a mason would naturally set to work on a text of the length given; but detailed study is needed to establish 20 letters as the only number possible.

The width of the lateral face in question is given by Meritt as "about 0.385 m."⁹ This may be accepted as a minimal figure, with 0.3865 m. as the nearest possible approximation.¹⁰

The margin at the left of the letters, between the epsilon of line 12 and the edge, is of 0.013 m., and a margin of similar magnitude is to be inferred at the (missing) right side. Before cutting his letters, the mason would draw horizontal lines across the stone, to keep the lines straight, parallel, and evenly separated. He would also, if the inscription were to be strictly stoichedon, draw a (vertical) line down the center of each stoichos or between each two stoichoi.¹¹ The correct formal test of whether an inscription is or is not strictly stoichedon is the question: Were vertical lines drawn? Such lines might be broad and not exactly spaced to the very millimeter; some slight irregularity is to be expected. In the present instance, vertical lines *were* drawn, and they were spaced quite regularly at intervals of close to 0.0181 m. On this basis, 20 letters and the two margins should occupy only 0.0024 m. (less than one-eighth of an inch) more than the width of the stele.¹² So tiny a discrepancy is allowable, and 20 letters is undoubted-

⁹ *Docs.*, p. 61; *ATL*, Vol. I, p. 3.

¹⁰ Dr. John H. Young, then Norton Fellow of Harvard University, made the measurements for this study from the stones in Athens. Each measurement was doubly checked by him before he entered it, with critical notes, on the drawings which had been sent for the purpose. I am grateful to him also for excellent squeezes which, being made of two thicknesses of filter paper, have been found to preserve the original dimensions without shrinking. The reader will find the problems easily intelligible if he has Meritt's drawings before him (*Docs.*, pp. 62, 64, 67, 68, and 69).

Young measures the width as 0.3865 m. just over line 1 of *ATL*, 15, where the joints appear to be tight.

Throughout this paper, I have stated amounts down to the fourth decimal place, but (as always) for the figure in the fourth place accuracy cannot be claimed, and is not claimed by me except—and this is usually the case herein—where it results from dividing into a number of equal parts a measurement which is reasonably correct to the third decimal place.

¹¹ For convenience of reckoning, I shall assume that the lines were in the centers of columns of letters (both schemes are illustrated in Austin, *Stoichedon*, pp. 26–27).

¹² That is, 19 intervals between vertical stoichos-lines $\times 0.0181$ m., plus 0.010 m. for the mean width of one letter, plus ($2 \times 0.0130 =$) 0.0260 m. for the two (equal) margins = 0.3889 m. Meritt's measurement gives a discrepancy slightly larger ($0.3889 - 0.3850 = 0.0039$), but still minute.

ly correct. Twenty-one letters would require at least 0.0205 m. (more than three-quarters of an inch) too much space, and 22 would require an excess of 0.0386 m. Both of these are out of the question. They could be admitted only on the egregious assumption that the stoichoi were crowded toward the right.¹³ Even so, the amount of crowding would be excessive.

Meritt's drawing (*Docs.*, p. 64, Fig. 12) therefore gives a correct impression of how the inscription was patterned, there being, as he claims, equal margins at the sides; 20 letters to a line; every letter falling in its proper stoichos; and all the stoichoi rigidly determined by vertical lines laid out on the marble before the letters were inscribed.

Thus solidly established, this instance of how a mason proceeded is instructive. It should be borne in mind that the inscription contained a fairly large number of letters and that the year was 454/3.

If a similar degree of mathematical exactitude had been observed in all comparable texts, the prescript of *ATL*, 8—the main problem of the present study—would present no problem except that of securing true measurements. Consideration of a later, shorter prescript, that of 440/39, will show, instead, that there is a "human element" to be reckoned with.

2. THE ERASURE IN THE PRESCRIPT OF *ATL*, 15

The prescript of *ATL*, 15 is of value for our study, because it too is cut on a narrow lateral face of the stele; because it is preserved or accurately restorable throughout; and because of its somewhat shorter length.¹⁴ The lines contain successively 17, 18, 19, 18 (as at present restored), 18, and 15 letters (*plus two vacats* at the end)—a total of 105 letters.

Before proceeding to study the design of the prescript as a whole (Part 3, below), we must note that the irregularity in the numbers of letters in the first three lines may not have been so great originally as it now appears. The entire name and demotic of the secretary are cut in a neat and shallow erasure recorded¹⁵ in *ATL*, Volume I, page 184;

¹³ Only one instance of such crowding is known to me, *IG*, I², 65: Meritt, *Docs.*, p. 31.

¹⁴ A drawing appears in *ATL*, Pl. 15: this should be studied, not the text on p. 141. In type it is difficult to reproduce arrangements of letters which are not stoichedon, and the preambles in *ATL* need to be controlled by the drawings.

¹⁵ In my review of *ATL* (*Amer. Jour. Archaeol.*, XLV [1941], 642), I stated erroneously that the first mention of this erasure was in *ATL*. Meritt had already recorded it in

see the photograph (*ibid.*, p. 22, Fig. 22). The editors remark that "the name [and demotic were] evidently changed immediately after the original name was cut. The inscription is stoichedon as far as the beginning of the name Σοσίστρ[α]τος, after which no attempt was made to preserve a regular spacing." It is true that the letters of the name and demotic in lines 2 and 3 were crowded; it is also true that all of lines 4, 5, and 6 are somewhat irregularly spaced; but the letters which follow the demotic in the remainder of line 3, namely, ΕΑΡΑΜ, are liberally spaced. They were cut, as a glance will show, without awareness of any need to crowd letters. Hence the erasure was made at some (undetermined) time after those 5 letters had been cut, because, if the erasure had been made before they were cut, presumably there would have been no crowding of the name and demotic: instead of 18 letters crowded into 13 regular spaces, we should have had the 18 letters spaced regularly in 18 spaces. It is possible that the mason made his correction *immediately* after cutting the letters ΕΑΡΑΜ, but the evidence thus far presented affords no positive reason for or against so believing. All that can be said is that the letters in the erasure seem to have been inscribed by the same mason who cut all the other letters.

In the form of a question, an explanation of the erasure is suggested in *ATL*, Volume I, page 184. Antiphon (περὶ τοῦ Ἡρώδου φόνου, 69 — 71 = *ATL*, T[estimonium] 11) speaks of a year in which malfeasance on the part of the hellenotamiai was discovered and all but one of the hellenotamiai, a certain Sosias, were executed. This explanation of the erasure might seem to be reinforced by another consideration. In the very next year the first tribal cycle known to us in the tenure of an Athenian office was inaugurated for the secretaries of the hellenotamiai (for some reason the tribes rotated in the reverse of the official order). Malfeasance might be held to be a likely cause for the decision not only to erase a name but also to inaugurate a cycle.

There are, however, difficulties not mentioned in *ATL*. In the first place, Antiphon says that the "older" men will recall the episode; but the interval was of only some twenty-five years. In the second place,

Amer. Jour. Archaeol., XXXIII (1929), 379, where he was careful to note also that the erasure explains "the undue crowding of the letters in line 3." Evidently through a mere slip the erasure was not specified in the text, or mentioned in the commentary, of *SEG*, V (1931), No. 15.

the name of the chairman, whoever he was (the present restoration is [Aισχ]ύλος Ἐλευ[σ]ί[ν]ιος), was not erased. Was he guilty? If he was guilty, why was his name not erased? If he was not guilty, why was the name of the secretary altered? There is good reason to believe that Aischylos (supposing the restoration to be correct) was not guilty, since he, or a relative of the same name, was secretary of the hellenotamiai, according to a plausible restoration by Dinsmoor, only three years later (*ATL*, Vol. I, pp. 187 and 184). Be this as it may, it is likely that the erasure of the secretary's name was not occasioned by his being convicted and that the year when nine of the hellenotamiai (Antiphon does not say that their secretary was included with the nine) were convicted was some other year, earlier than 440/39.

Some light, if not much, can be thrown on the reason for the erasure by observation of a few surviving traces of the name originally inscribed there. Hitherto no traces of this name have been recorded. Of the first letter no sure trace remains; faint marks which might belong to the right half of a badly formed chi are probably spurious. The remaining space (end of line 2) would suffice for $1\frac{1}{2}$ letters, as at the end of line 1 exactly above: and IO show clearly. If the round letter were theta, a trace of the central dot would almost certainly appear. In the first space of line 3 faint marks suggest nu, but they cannot positively be said to have the character of chisel strokes. After this space, and directly under the vertical stroke of the kappa in line 2, there is a clear vertical stroke which would be too far to the left for iota—if the stoichedon scheme were being approximately followed—but which would be suitable for part of B, E, K, L, N, Γ, or P. In the remainder of the erasure I have failed to read any strokes.

Since the first three letters lie directly beneath those above; since the end of line 3 likewise copies the stoichedon scheme; and since the name and demotic, inscribed after the erasure was made, are crowded into the space available, we may assume that the stoichedon order was originally followed throughout the area now erased. We thus have . IO . /⁹ for which, e.g., [Δ]ιό[δ]ε[s^{demotic, 8}] would fit. (This particular name, however, is unlikely; see below, p. 380.)

A clerical error which would have meant a gross misspelling at the very beginning of Σοσίστρατος *hysbades* seems most improbable in itself. Hence the erasure means a real change of names, i.e., of secre-

taries. Besides, since presumably it was the secretary himself who prepared the mason's copy, and since the mason must have known his name, the notion of a clerical error may be dismissed. Ergo, there was probably an actual change of secretaries in the course of 440/39. It is not unlikely that the secretary first in office died (but not by execution) and that his successor caused his own name to be substituted. More probably, as Professor Ferguson has suggested to me, the *suffectus* may have caused his own name to be inscribed and may then have been forced by his superiors to substitute the name of the first secretary, who had done the real work.

3. THE STOICHEDON ORDER IN THE PRESCRIPT OF *ATL*, 15

Originally, therefore, the number of letters in the successive lines of the inscription was not 17, 18, 19, [18], 18, and 15 + 2 blank spaces, but 17, 17, 16, [18], 18, etc. Since no more of the irregularities can be explained away, we must inquire how the mason proceeded in order to produce an arrangement so different from that of the postscript of *ATL*, 1, which we found to be strictly stoichedon. At first glance, lines 1 and 2 of *ATL*, 15 look as though a strict stoichedon design had been begun. Measurements show, however, that the irregularities of spacing in line 1 are too great to permit the supposition that vertical lines for stoichoi were in fact drawn: moreover, the greatest irregularity occurs in relation to the third letter, iota. Because of the unique thinness of iota, observation of its spatial relations to the adjacent letters is always the readiest practical test of whether or not a design is stoichedon. The conclusion here must be that vertical lines were not drawn. But no mason working on a document of this sort in 439 B.C. could altogether escape the influence of the stoichedon design. Actually, he succeeded in spacing out the letters in line 1 fairly evenly. The occurrence of an iota toward the end of the line enabled him to crowd in a final delta. Inscribing line 2, he carefully placed each letter under the one above; line 3 was probably cut in the same manner, except that a mu (the uniquely long letter) did not allow him to insert a seventeenth letter—which would have been a second mu—at the end. The carelessness which led him to omit the usual vertical lines also led him to crowd the letters in lines [4] and 5 and at the beginning of line 6: he appears to have become apprehensive about using too

much space. In line 6 he probably felt that it was desirable to begin the heading Ἴονικὸς φόρος directly over the first letter of the name of the first city. Presently, as he reached the letters ΦΟΡΟΣ at the end of line 6, he realized that ample space remained. It is notable, as will appear below, that he then widened appreciably the interspaces between these last letters.

The mason of *ATL*, 15 is thus understandable. He had to inscribe a prescript-plus-heading of ca. 102 letters. If the number of letters had been three times as many, he would probably have counted the letters and would then have laid out vertical lines to accommodate them. As it was, he had comparatively few letters to deal with, and being careless he made no count, but began with large letters (0.018 m. high) in what we may call the "loose," i.e., unguided-by-ruled-lines, manner.¹⁶ This he abandoned in line 4 or 5 in favor of greater crowding, which he relaxed only as he finished inserting the heading for the Ionic panel at the very end.¹⁷

Apart from the postscript of *ATL*, 1, we have no other postscripts or prescripts on the lateral faces of the First Stele well enough preserved to be helpful. So far as can be determined, however, the other prescripts on all four faces of the First Stele (still leaving aside the postscript of *ATL*, 1) are stoichedon, except that, in the several cases where the prescript is of one line, vertical lines were not laid out to determine stoichoi. In exact accord with this preference for stoichedon in prescripts, a preference evident down to 440/39, is the fact that the lists of cities were laid out stoichedon for every year from 454/3 down to 440/39 and beyond.¹⁸ In his list as well as in his prescript the mason of 440/39 neglected to lay out a stoichedon design.

¹⁶ For a different kind of modified stoichedon cf. Austin, *Stoichedon*, pp. 43-49, and Dow, *Harvard Stud. Class. Phil.*, XLVIII (1937), 143-48.

¹⁷ With this preamble compare that of *ATL*, 22 (see Pl. XXI). Here there were ca. 98-100 letters to be inscribed. Lines for stoichoi may have been laid out, but no accurate count of letters was made, so that, instead of too much space in the last line (7), there remained too little, as the crowded letters preserved plainly show. The (lost) demotic therefore contained 8 letters or more, though not over 10.

¹⁸ I.e., vertical lines were regularly drawn. In the actual cutting these lines were occasionally disregarded for one reason or another. In the Second Stele also, the stoichedon order prevailed normally throughout, i.e., through 432/1, in both prescripts and lists (Austin, *Stoichedon*, p. 57). *ATL*, Vol. I lacks any systematic discussion of how the lists were inscribed.

Thus far, then, we have established that an earlier inscription, namely the postscript of 454/3, was perfectly stoichedon; and that a later inscription, namely the prescript of 440/39, was begun as loose, i.e., unguided, stoichedon.

4. THE DATE OF *ATL*, 8

Our main problem is the prescript of *ATL*, 8, which was restored as follows by Meritt in *Docs.*, pages 66–69, with a drawing on page 69:

447/6 B.C.	Ἐπὶ τῆς ἀ[ρχῆς τῆς ὀγδόης]	Loose
	ἧτι Διόδ[εος ἐγραμμάτευε]	stoich.
	[Π]αιονί[δες]	20

As in the other two inscriptions which we have considered, the main problem is the length of line. The name of the secretary is not given by any other document. Gomme (*CR*, LIV [1940], 66) has stressed the fact, which Meritt mentions but does not stress, that the name Διόδεος (i.e., Διόδωτος: see Gomme's note) is known to occur only once in any Athenian document. The names Διόδωτος and Διόδωρος are common, of course, in all periods. There is thus an initial presumption that line 2 had 22, not 20, letters.

The mason who inscribed the prescript of *ATL*, 8 was also working on a lateral face of the stele. Up above, on the same face, was the postscript of *ATL*, 1, of 454/3, which as we have seen was laid out stoichedon with 20 letters to a line. This possible model he did *not* choose to follow,¹⁹ at least not in detail, as the differences in the (preserved) margins prove: the postscript has a margin of 0.013 m., whereas the prescript of *ATL*, 8 has a margin of only 0.005 m.²⁰ The mason of *ATL*, 8 cut his list of cities stoichedon; but this does not prove that his prescript was also stoichedon, since, had the prescript been of only one line, he almost certainly would not have spaced out the letters by actual measurements, but would have spaced them out freely by eye, like the other one-line headings on this stele.

¹⁹ Though without discussing the differences of the margins, Meritt uses the postscript as evidence for the preamble (*Docs.*, pp. 66, 69).

²⁰ I have adopted Young's figure. Meritt nowhere states what he considers the correct measurement to be. His drawings seem to allow close to 0.008 m., but the edge is so ragged that this figure has no value if it is based on a squeeze. The photograph (*ATL*, p. 14), seems to admit a little over 0.006 m., but not 0.007 m.

Actually, he had at most 53 letters to inscribe in his prescript, so that about two and a half lines were needed. The first question is: Did he lay out on the stone vertical lines for stoichoi? Measurements in the first two lines show a maximum divergence of 0.0045 m. in the spacings between centers of letters. This is a small amount, but it is too great, I think, to allow us safely to suppose that he drew vertical lines. On the other hand, of the 8 spaces before and after the preserved iotas, only one is definitely small (close to 0.0138 m.). This indicates that lines 1 and 2 of the inscription, though spaced in the "loose" stoichedon manner, are almost as accurately stoichedon as if vertical lines had been drawn.

The next question is: Did he adhere to this spacing in the missing parts of lines 1 and 2? Meritt has assumed, for reasons which we shall examine presently, that he did not, but rather that in the missing (later) parts of lines 1 and 2 he lengthened the spacing. A drawing, admirably executed, on page 69 of *Docs.* shows these 20-letter lines, the text being that already given above (p. 380). The attentive reader may discover for himself in that drawing two reasons for doubting its correctness. First, the margin on the right is almost three times as wide as that on the left (0.013 m. or 0.014 m., as against 0.005 m.). Meritt declares (*Docs.*, p. 67), without discussion: "The difference of 0.014 m. would be quite properly absorbed by the necessary margin after the last letter of the line." We have found reason, however, for believing that in the postscript of *ATL*, 1 (just above on the stele) the margins were precisely equal to each other—as they are shown in Meritt's drawing (*op. cit.*, p. 64). Though significant examples of unequal margins might perhaps be found (I recall none), they are all certainly exceptional: the Greek instinct was for symmetry. Second, to assume lengthened spacing in lines 1 and 2 is to disregard the common practice,²¹ exemplified as we have seen by the prescript of *ATL*, 15, whereby spacing was not lengthened until the final line, if at all. In fact, that inscription would lead us to expect spacing not less crowded but more crowded at the ends of lines before the last.

²¹ Exceptionally, an early dedicatory inscription, the Leagros base (*Hesperia*, V [1936], 359), has lengthened spacing in the first of its 1½ lines. The object was to fill out the line, but the spacing is careless throughout. Doubtless some more significant exceptions could be found.

Meritt (*Docs.*, pp. 66-67) reckons that actually on the basis of the spacing in lines 1 and 2 (and allowing for a margin not of 0.005 but of 0.014 m. at the right) lines 1 and 2 should have 21 letters each. But, since no permissible restoration will give 21 letters, he turns to line 3 for guidance. Here the spacing is wider and, as it happens, more regular. The regularity is taken to be an indication that in line 3 the true norm can be detected. By applying this wider spacing to the missing parts of lines 1 and 2, lines of 20 letters each are easily justified.

This hypothesis is open to criticism on two grounds. One is that in loose stoichedon there is no fixed mathematical norm: the norm was fixed by eye. The other is that this visual norm should not be sought in the last line of a text. The relaxed spacing in line 3 can be readily understood as an exact counterpart of what has been observed already in line 6 of *ATL*, 15. Such relaxation of spacing in the final line of a text is in fact a natural tendency in all letter-cutting. The general principle may be formulated as follows: If the last line of an inscription has fewer letters than the previous lines, the mason will normally feel an impulse to widen the spacing between letters in that last line; whether or not he actually cuts the letters at wider intervals will depend on habit or on the degree of compulsion which he feels about carrying through the previous spacing to the very end. It is easier to cut letters somewhat apart than near together: relaxed spacing on the stone is a sign that the mason himself was relaxing his carefulness.²² Actually, the Athenian inscriptions show that regularity, alike in inscriptions which are stoichedon and in those which are not, was commonly maintained to the very end; but there are some inscriptions, dating from nearly every period, which have the widely spaced last line.²³

It seems clear, therefore, that our only proper guide is the spacing

²² Austin, who mentions relaxed spacing only twice (*op. cit.*, pp. 55, 56), explains it for *ATL*, 21 (for *ATL*, 8 this explanation would not apply, and Austin gives none) as due to a desire to reduce the vacant space at the end. If however the mason had wished to eliminate altogether the vacant space at the end of line 2 in *ATL*, 21, he could easily have done so, by spacing out the letters like a modern typesetter. Greek masons almost never did such a thing.

²³ The following examples may be cited: (1) *IG*, I², 6 (see *IG*, I, Suppl., 1); (2) *IG*, I², 94 (see *IG*, I, Suppl., 53a); (3) *ATL*, 21, line 2 (see Pl. XX); (4) *IG*, I, 304 B, line 92 (see Meritt, *Ath. Fin. Docs.*, Pl. XI); (5) *IG*, I², 943; (6) *Hesperia*, IV (1935), 528; (7) *IG*, II², 968 (see Kirchner, *Imagines*, No. 104); (8) *IG*, II², 2336, line 4.

in the preserved parts of lines 1 and 2, which as has been noted are irregular but not grossly irregular. On this basis, the reckoning is as follows: The mean interval between letter-centers in both lines 1 and 2 is close to $0.017\frac{2}{3}$ m. This is Meritt's figure. Young's differs minutely, 0.0180 m.; he remarks that it is a difficult measurement to obtain from the stone. In each case the figure is obtained by measuring together six intervals between letter-centers, and dividing by six. The margin at the left is of *ca.* 0.005 m., as we have seen, or at most 0.0065 m. The mean width of the broader letters is 0.011 m.; but it so happens that the first and last letters, whose width here comes in question, are narrow: each is only 0.007 m. wide. Computed on the assumption that the missing parts of lines 1 and 2 were spaced regularly, the stele would have needed ideally to be only 0.0015 m. (the thickness of the lead in a lead pencil) in excess of the known width in order to accommodate a line of 22 letters.²⁴ In other words, the reckoning favors 22 letters decisively. A line of 20 letters would seem to be so improbable as not to be worth considering, unless one admits fairly gross irregularities.²⁵

In conformity with all the indications thus far considered, the restoration in *ATL*, 8 should be with 22 letters spaced out approximately stoichedon in each of the first two lines:

448/7 B.C.	'Επὶ τῆς ἀ[ρχῆς τῆς ἡεβδόμης]	Loose
	ἡεὶ Διόδ[. . os ἐγραμμάτευε]	stoich.
	[ΙΙ]αἰονί[δες vacat]	22

There is, however, one later prescript which must be taken into account. If we descend some fifteen years, beyond *ATL*, 8 and beyond the First Stele entirely, to the Second Stele, to *ATL*, 23, of 432/1,

²⁴ Twenty-one spaces between letter-centers $\times 0.017\frac{2}{3}$ m., *plus* 0.007 m. (width of one letter), *plus* 0.010 m. (margins) = 0.3880 m. The true width (above, p. 374, n. 10) is 0.3865 m.

The reckoning with all the barely allowable adverse figures would be as follows: 21 spaces between letter-centers $\times 0.018$ m., *plus* 0.007 m. (width of one letter), *plus* 0.013 m. (margins) = 0.398 m. If the true width were 0.385 m., the excess demanded by 22 letters would be 0.013 m., or about half an inch. Slight crowding could absorb this amount.

²⁵ In order to accommodate a line of 20 letters, the spacing would have had to be lengthened in the missing parts of lines 1 and 2 from $0.017\frac{2}{3}$ m. to $0.020\frac{1}{4}$ m. Even in the third line, where markedly wider spacing is preserved, there is only one space between letter-centers as wide as 0.020 m.

we find that the mason left two blank spaces at the (preserved) end of line 2 in order to begin line 3 with a new word. Now lines 2 and 3 in the prescript of *ATL*, 8 also begin with words. It might seem arguable that here, as in *ATL*, 23, two spaces were left blank at the end of line 1, so that *ὄγδοες* could be restored, even though, as has now been established, line 2 had the full 22 letters:

447/6 B.C.	'Επὶ τῆς ἀ[ρχῆς τῆς ὄγδοες ὡ]	Loose
	ἡεὶ Διόδ[. . os ἐγραμμάτευε]	stoich.
	[II]αὶοῖ[δες vacat]	22

In fact the older editions of *ATL*, 8, such as *IG*, I², 198, have this arrangement, which Austin recently accepted (*Stoichedon*, p. 55), apparently without knowing the alternative. It would be straining the evidence to say that *ὄγδοες* and two blank spaces are utterly excluded; but they can be adopted only by neglecting nearer evidence in favor of evidence more remote. Syllabification is not observed consistently throughout any prescript which is significant in this respect on the First Stele. Instead, in *ATL*, 15, at the end of line 1, as we have seen, the mason crowded in a delta, although he could have ended the line with a word by carrying the delta over to the following line. Hence the mason of *ATL*, 8, if he had had two spaces left after the ordinal adjective at the end of line 1, would probably have inserted the whole of HEI.

On these grounds there is a clear preference, though not an absolute compulsion, for avoiding blank spaces, by restoring *ἡεβδόμης*. This conclusion means that *ATL*, 8 belongs not in the eighth, but in the seventh year, 448/7. Hence the year at present alleged to be without a list is not the sixth year, 449/8 (in which *ATL*, 7 must now be dated), but the eighth year, 447/6. These conclusions will appear in a larger setting in the second study.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

THE ENIGMA OF HORACE'S MOTHER¹

WILLIAM HARDY ALEXANDER

THE question of the racial origin of Rome's great lyricist and satirist is really forced upon us by Horace's own repeated insistence on the fact that his father was an ex-slave.² As the poet was born in or near Venusia and the colony of Venusia was enrolled in the rural tribe Horatia, it may reasonably be supposed that the father derived his name from that fact, having been a slave of the municipality, apparently in some minor financial capacity.³

Now the originally servile status of Horatius the father creates at once a question as to that father's racial origin and, of course, as to that of his famous son after him. It is clear that we cannot be certain, but we ought not to allow ourselves to be led away into wishful thinking. I have in mind the sort of thing typified by Sellar, who writes:

Although, in consequence of his father's servile origin, we cannot be sure of the race to which he [the poet] belonged by birth, yet the strong grain of Italian character and the Italian shrewdness of observation, apparent in his familiar writings, suggest his affinity with that branch of the race which retained longest its original stamp.⁴

This is probably the usual uncritical opinion, served up in a thousand classrooms, but the sentiments expressed by the poet might just as

¹ A classical scholar of wide repute to whom I read this paper felt that he had summarily disposed of its importance by asking me what literary men of antiquity were concerned about their parentage or had had anything to say about their fathers or mothers. But, of course, he missed the point entirely. Granted that none of them did, Horace's constant harking back to the subject until, to tell the truth, we grow a little tired of it, only becomes the more striking, if anything. If the others said nothing, no doubt it was that they felt they had nothing to worry about. Horace evidently had plenty.

² *Sat.* i. 6. 6, 45-46; *Epist.* i. 20. 20. The phrase is always the same "me libertino patre natum" with its cold, legalistic formalism, undisguised and unmitigated, almost as if the poet were rolling with some gusto a bitter morsel under his tongue.

³ "Exactionum coactore," *Vita Horatii apud Suetonium* (ed. Roth), p. 297. The view of the name origin given above is the one that has prevailed since C. L. Grotefend's article on the subject in *Zeitschrift für die Altertumswissenschaft*, I (1834), 182-84, but has recently been challenged by L. Halkin in *L'Antiquité classique*, IV (1935), 125 ff. The point is of interest but not particularly so for this discussion.

⁴ W. Y. Sellar, *Horace and the Elegiac Poets* (Oxford, 1892), p. 9.

well be the result of physical propinquity to the simple Italic folk of his birthplace and of an education evidently designed by the father to make as nearly as possible a normal Roman out of the son and cannot be considered conclusive evidence on the father's racial origin. In a country like America it should not be necessary to do more than point out that a boy of, let us say, Yugoslavian parentage may very well employ with entire sincerity and powerful effect expressions of American national feeling couched in admirable English; this arises out of his American schooling and out of his constant association with children of an American tradition longer than his.

The idea is advanced by E. A. Sonnenschein⁵ that Horace speaks of himself racially as *Sabellus*, that is, apparently, as a Samnite; but the only one of the three passages he mentions which might conceivably refer to Horace, viz., *Epist.* i. 16. 49, is more capable of an interpretation of a perfectly general character; the *Sabellus* of the passage just indicated seems in the connection to mean a Samnite (i.e., any Samnite), as representative of sound ethical views, not specifically the poet.

There have been those who attribute a Greek origin to Horace, for example, Dr. James Gow, who writes briefly and to the point: "The foundation for the suggestion that the father was a Greek is merely (1) that he had been a slave and must have been a foreigner, and (2) that Horace at an early age was sufficiently fluent in Greek to write Greek verses (*Sat.* 1, 10, 31-35)."⁶ But it must be observed, first, that the "foreigner" could easily have been found in Italy itself among those stocks subjugated by Rome and not included in her various shades of mercy, such as the redoubtable Samnites; and, second, that, while Horace's report of himself as having once as a lad taken to writing Greek verse, when combined with his triumphant handling of Greek lyrical meters in Latin in his maturity, does point to a more intimate knowledge of the Greek language on a very difficult side than one would expect from one of Italian descent, it is inconclusive as to a Greek origin. Lucian Mueller was also influenced by Horace's penetration into the secrets of Greek poetry, as well as by his "feeling for human-

⁵ *CR*, XI (1897), 339; XII (1898), 365.

⁶ In his edition of Horace's *Odes and Epodes* (Cambridge University Press, 1896), *Introd.*, p. ix, n. 5.

ity, released from bounds of time and space" and by his genuine Greek cheerfulness, to the point of saying that, if a guess had to be hazarded as to his ancestors, one might well conclude that Greek blood flowed in his veins and that one of his forbears, through some chance or other, had been brought to Italy as a slave from Greece or Asia Minor.⁷

All these seem to be attempts to keep Horace's ancestry within the confines of one or the other of the two classical stocks, but there have been other suggestions as well. Two generations ago Guglielmo Braun was arguing that the poet's father was a pious and enlightened Jew of the Alexandrian persuasion.⁸ Otto Seeck felt that in their acuteness and pungent charm the *Satires* and the *Epistles* recall the minor prose works of Heine or Boerne and continues: "Übrigens ist es nicht unmöglich, dass er ein Stammesgenosse jener beiden war; denn sein Vater gehörte zu den Freigelassenen, die sich damals zum grössten Teil aus den semitischen Gegenden Asiens und Syriens rekrutierten."⁹ About this same time Hugh E. P. Platt, fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford, noted that his brother, an English major of artillery, had hazarded the guess that Horace was of Semitic extraction: "He instanced Terence, Lucian, and Heine as exemplifying the satiric outlook on life produced by the contact of Semitic blood with western civilization."¹⁰ Finally Karl Mras, examining the same question only half-a-dozen years ago, pronounced, with much more definiteness than the material he submits would seem to warrant, "mit Judentum ist es also nichts" but argues nonetheless at length for a Levantine origin for Horace, basing his position on a number of qualities exhibited by the poet which he regards reasonably enough as characteristic of natives of the eastern Mediterranean area and their descendants.¹¹ There is noted as well the social-economic fact that, from the middle of the second century B.C. on, Asia Minor and Syria were the happy hunting grounds of slavers and that their human prey was landed regularly at Brundisium, the

⁷ *Quintus Horatius Flaccus: eine litterarhistorische Biographie* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1880), p. 12.

⁸ In *Archeografo triestino*, V (1877-78), 247-82.

⁹ *Kaiser Augustus*, "Monographien zur Weltgeschichte" [Leipzig, 1902], p. 134.

¹⁰ *A Last Ramble in the Classics* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1906), p. 54.

¹¹ In the article, "Horaz als Mensch und als Dichter," *Wiener Studien*, LIV (1936), 72-79.

southern terminus of the Appian Way, on which Venusia was situated, some distance north and west.

All that has been collected here so far relates to the racial origin of Horace's father or of the poet himself as determined by his father's country of birth; but human procreation is bilateral, despite the obliviousness of the critics and commentators, and this is a circumstance of profound importance in its bearing on racial origin in any given case; in short, we should feel bound to ask ourselves what, if anything, is known or can be known about Horace's mother. Yet, as far as I can discover, there has never been but one paper published relating to her; it came from the pen of a German schoolmaster named Rosenberg. His thesis briefly is that, by inference from the laudatory manner in which Horace speaks of mothers in general, we may conclude that the poet had had a good mother and that she had lived long enough to have left him definite memories of a mother's tender care; further, that, while she is not named, her character is outlined and perpetuated in such well-known passages as *Epodes* 2. 39-48 and *Odes* iii. 6. 37-40.¹² The most interesting point in Rosenberg's paper is the suggestion that Horace did have memories of his mother, contrary to the general belief that she must have died while he was still an infant and perhaps, indeed, in childbirth, and that he perpetuated those memories in his written work though without specific mention of her. The passages indicated above are, however, a quite insufficient basis on which to rest such a conclusion; one might just as well argue that Horace undertook to glorify motherhood in those places in his works because his own mother had proved disappointing and unsatisfactory and that he was actually creating a compensation picture for himself. Yet, if Horace's mother died in giving him birth or in the days of his early infancy, it is indeed odd that Horace, who can be so thoroughly sentimental at times, never says a single word about the person from whom his physical existence directly came, certainly no word that is specific and direct.

It is true that there are two places in which Horace appears to speak of his *parentes*. In *Sat.* i. 6. 96 the poet says that, if people had a chance to go back in life and pick their parents according to their own matured tastes, he would, "*meis contentus*," not select those who had

¹² "Horzens Mutter," *Monatsschrift für höheren Schulen*, V (1906), 645-50.

been glorified by the holding of high office. But the whole context shows that Horace is here expressing a sense of obligation to his father only.¹³ The *meis* arises simply because, having in his general proposition relating to humanity as a whole used the plural *parentes*, he could not very well in referring to himself write *meo* and not *meis*; the plural is obviously the right and natural thing (at least in most cases, surely, in such a connection) to write. Again in *Odes* ii. 20. 5-6 Horace uses the words "non ego pauperum/sanguis parentum," but I take *parentes* to mean here, as not uncommonly, "forbears"; and even if it is taken literally, it conveys no more information about his mother than that he had one and the additional fact, also pretty obvious, that she had been poor.

The enigma here begins to emerge. Why is she never mentioned, while the poet is lavish in references to his father? Lucian Mueller can think of a reason—the usual thing that a man would think of—something uncomplimentary to the woman's character, namely, that she was "eine ziemlich untergeordnete, vielleicht auch pflichtvergessene Frau" and so best forgotten and unsung.¹⁴ That is too easy. We should not be so readily satisfied to make the woman pay. There is the overlooked possibility that the father, when he began to get some idea of his son's capabilities and to calculate the lad's prospects, decided that his maternal ancestor must be suppressed as detrimental to the boy's future and that Horace himself accepted the necessity of his father's decision and maintained its terms with extraordinary carefulness and almost complete success. Most of us have known people who have been singularly reticent about one parent; there is something, we may be sure, about this parent which constitutes the blot on the family escutcheon. I therefore hazard the suggestion that not only was Horace's father Levantine, as is now commonly agreed, but that his mother was not improbably Levantine plus, by which I mean a Jewess.¹⁵ For prudential reasons she was ignored but, nonetheless, passed

¹³ Hence Maclean's note at this point in his third edition (p. 401) is absurd beyond the usual run of commentator's nonsense: "We know nothing of Horace's mother, but he here intimates his respect for her memory as well as his father's." I cannot think of anything more microscopically minute in the way of respect.

¹⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 13.

¹⁵ I wish here to reprint Mrs. M. Mas's noble note written just a few months before the inclusion of his Austria into a system of government to which such words are anathema: "Es lohnt sich doch, diese Frage einmal erschöpfend zu behandeln, wobei ich mit allem

on to her son some definitely foreign traits—incidentally, very brilliant traits. Now it was quite all right for a Levantine, forming a unit in a servile society, to have married (or perhaps merely have cohabited with) a Jewess, but not at all helpful for a person seeking to emerge from slave status and its hateful memories into that of a Roman citizen with its dignities and privileges. Still less helpful would it prove for such a person's son, as he gave promise of rising in the Roman world, to admit origin from a servile union (or perhaps merely cohabitation) of two Levantines, and one of these a Jewess.¹⁶

In *Sat. i. 6. 34-37* a striking phrase occurs which I have italicized:

sic qui promittit civis, urbem sibi curae,
imperium fore et Italiam, delubra deorum,
quo patre sit natus, *num ignota matre inhonestus*,
omnis mortalis curare et quaerere cogit.

The point of the whole passage, of which this is but a very small part, is that there is full justification for concern on the part of everybody over the parentage and the consequent social position of a person who assumes control over the destinies of the Roman world but that there need be none, at least among sensible men, with regard to a person of equivocal birth who is making no claims and airing no pretensions. Now it is very striking that in writing a satire that so directly discusses his own station in life Horace should allow it as a specific test with regard to the prospective head of the Roman state that he should not be *ignota matre inhonestus*; it seems like the transference to anyone aspiring to this headship of a challenge made against Horace himself and, tacitly at least, admitted by him. *Ignota* here means "low-born," precisely as in verse 6 of this same satire and as in Cicero's *ignotissimo Phryge* in his *Pro Flacco* (17, 40). Horace's mother was "low born"; yet she cannot have been a slave at the time of his birth because, had

Nachdruck erkläre, erstens dass ich ohne jede Voreingenommenheit zu dieser Untersuchung geschritten bin, und zweitens dass die Zugehörigkeit zu irgendeiner Rasse in meinen Augen weder einen Vorrang noch eine Minderwertigkeit für jemand bedeutet" (*op. cit.*, p. 73, n. 16). I crave the privilege of subscribing to this humanistic declaration.

¹⁶ It may be, of course, that I am overstressing the mother's probable racial origin here; but I think it must be admitted that the probabilities all point to a Levantine male slave's finding as his sex companion a Levantine female slave. I am suggesting, if I may repeat myself, that she was *so much Levantine* that father and son in the new life opening up before them decided to drop her out of the picture. If she died young, the chances of successfully doing so were improved.

she been, the taint of servitude would have passed to the son. Hence *ignota* cannot refer to a condition of being low born as a result of her slave status. There must have been something else that made her *ignota*, "low born," and I am suggesting that it was a racial origin which was definitely of a kind that a Roman would find even more intolerable than that of Horace's father. If it were not more intolerable, why all this suppression? If Horace had come out clearly *even once* and said that his father was of an Italic strain, then it could readily be understood that *any* foreign strain in the mother would make her more low born as a matter of racial origin. Since he does not make that claim for his father, obviously because he could not do so, we are well justified in supposing that his father was, all circumstances taken into account, of Levantine descent and his mother something even more Levantine yet, since all mention of her was by father and son, presumably on consideration, blotted out of the book of life.

One of the points of which much was made against Horace was the impropriety of his having been commissioned as *tribunus* in the army of the Liberators. He, the son of a freedman father and a mother who must not even be mentioned apparently, is made the object of attack because of his intimacy with Maecenas,

at olim
quod mihi pareret legio Romana tribuno.¹⁷

Horace admits in the two verses immediately following that there was force and weight in the objection:

forsit honorem
iure mihi invidet quivis.

I call attention to the word *iure*. What was the nature of the objection, the reasonableness of which Horace recognizes? It was undoubtedly resented that the son of an ex-slave should, as a commissioned officer, be issuing orders to honest Roman citizens, fully *ingenui*, in the ranks; the son of a *libertinus* still stood very close in the Roman estimate to servitude itself. Yet elsewhere Horace stands up valiantly for this freedman father; why is he less doughty a champion at this point? I suggest that a reflection is here found of that social snobbishness which has through all recorded history marked the officer caste and has

¹⁷ *Sa.* i. 6. 47-48.

always been acknowledged as a just criterion of social standing, even by those within that caste who have suffered from its application. There was a lot of unpleasant talk in the officers' mess of Brutus' army about the upstart *tribunus* and not a little of it possibly attached itself to his mother, the *ignota*. It is worth remembering here with what ironic bitterness Horace refers to his associates in the "swift run" at Philippi, those "blow-hards" (*minaces*) of one day who "ate dirt" (*turpe solum tetigere mento*) the next.¹⁸ One can imagine one reason why he had little occasion to love them.

That Horace was not popular at Rome is a commonplace among those who study his works to be informed as well as entertained, and the reference now is not to unpopularity among the learned and literary folk,¹⁹ which might well make the subject of another paper; the whole passage *Sat.* ii. 6. 40-58 deals with a general unpopularity incurred through insinuating himself into the good graces of Maecenas and refusing to allow anyone else to profit from his acquaintance in high quarters. It is represented as a growing unpopularity ("subiectior in diem et horam/invidiae noster"); and from the association in *Sat.* i. 6 of the unpopularity there described with the words *libertino patre natus, ignotos, ignota matre*, and the like we shall be right, I think, in assuming that much of Horace's unpopularity was based on the circumstances of his birth, taken in conjunction with his worldly success. And even though Horace's father and the poet himself kept dead silence about the *ignota mater* for policy's sake, that silence, far from averting suspicion, criticism, and ill-will, would in the end merely amplify the whispering campaign. From Horace's own words in several places we can practically put together the damning question in its verbal form: "Who, in the name of all that is good and holy, is this son of a dirty²⁰ Levantine and a mother he cannot even mention, that he should have insinuated himself into the good graces of Maecenas?"

And if the generality did not like Horace, no more did Horace like the generality. "*Odi profanum vulgus*" may have the esoteric meaning which the commentators like to attach to it, but it looks remarkably

¹⁸ *Odes* ii. 7. 11-12. Well emphasized by Mras, p. 81.

¹⁹ As, for example, why did Ovid omit his name entirely from the list of the great Latin poets, *AA* iii. 333 ff.? Let us not hear that it was "metrically impossible"!

²⁰ *Sat.* ii. 5. 18: *spurco Damae*.

like the expression of a frank dislike for the masses. That Fate, which for once did not cheat, permitted him to cultivate a scorn for the *malignum vulgus* is for Horace the equivalent of what great riches and glory meant for other men.²¹ He scorned the usual methods of ingratiating himself with the city mob:

non ego ventosae plebis suffragia venor
impensis cenarum et tritae munere vestis;²²

but the mob had its revenge, we may be sure. Thus not one word of Horace's works appears among the Pompeian *graffiti*, even though the professorial and rather evangelical Lucretius gained that distinction.²³ One may well be justified in conjecturing that Horace's dislike of the generality lay, as is sometimes the case with individuals in our own society in modern times, in the fact that his own origin was far too much on a par with that of most of them and that he felt uncomfortable in associating with them, at least in their masses, because he had been completely educated away from them and had forsworn at least one part of his birth. The one place where he could feel reasonably at home was with men of broad views who did not raise awkward questions about parentage; hence his unfailing devotion to Augustus and Maecenas.²⁴ In the case of the latter, perhaps the significance of foreign blood was a little clearer than to most; after all the Etruscans were a strange folk, *ignota matre*! Has it been sufficiently noticed how fond Horace is of bringing up this matter of Maecenas' foreign extraction?

There has always been the need, too, of an explanation of a certain something about Horace's general attitude toward life; it does not seem like a typically Roman attitude. The life that he exalts is not the life of action but that of contemplation and reflection or, indeed, at

²¹ *Odes* ii. 16. 39-40.

²² *Epist.* i. 19. 37-38.

²³ E. Froebel (*Quid veteres de Horatii poematis iudicaverint* [Jena doctoral diss., 1911], p. 18) thinks that this is pure chance. I feel, on the contrary, that it must be regarded as a significant piece of evidence in determining the extent to which Horace was generally known and read in the ancient world.

²⁴ *Sat.* i. 6. 1-6. Horace's much talked of "independence" toward Maecenas is quite open to being considered a studied encomium on the New Order. If men grumbled about the passing of liberty, how easy for Maecenas to point to Horace's "freedom of expression"! On Maecenas' dubious antecedents generally see L. A. MacKay in *C.P.*, XXXVII (1942), 80.

times of *dolce far niente*. He lampoons "practical education" in his dry humor about the large part played in it by the mental arithmetic of money transactions.²⁵ He is incessantly preaching too, and I am disposed, not unreasonably, I hope, to look on this as a native trait bursting out through his overlaid Romanism.²⁶

But these are the merest details in comparison with a much more striking feature in Horace's makeup—I refer to his all-pervading, mildly cynical irony about men and things. As he gazes on the human spectacle, he cannot get either infuriated at vice or enthusiastic over virtue or what passes for it. Good and bad are not so easily established and kept defined as the unphilosophic Roman mind supposed on the basis of its national traditions.²⁷ And in general why worry about the necessity of achievement?

quid brevi fortes iaculamur aevo
multa?²⁸

The way to handle life practically is not by profound reflection nor yet by strenuous action; simply take it as it comes, enjoying the ups of fortune and not complaining about the downs. This is the quality in the poetry of Horace which provoked Goethe to speak of his "furchtbare Realität"; but the phrase is unfortunate and, indeed, unfair. It is "furchtbar" only when viewed from the standpoint of a highly emphasized spirituality and poetical sensibility like Goethe's, and its "Realität" is by no means more repulsive or alarming than are men and women themselves.

It has been pointed out²⁹ that this irony, not unkindly for the most part, was also developed powerfully in the case of two other great writers, namely, Lucian in ancient times, a Syrian brought into contact with the materially prosperous civilization of the West and its smug philosophies of self-justification, and in the nineteenth century,

²⁵ *AP*, 325-32.

²⁶ I agree with Hugh Platt (*op. cit.*, p. 185) that this is probably the reason for Horace's great vogue among the English in the past. They loved preaching in those days and still retain some hankering after it, without, however, intending at any time to be too seriously influenced by it. Is not Horace just the preacher for such an attitude? He moralizes on and on, but I cannot think of anyone's being seriously moved to virtue by him.

²⁷ *Sat.* i. 3. 113 ff.

²⁸ *Odes* ii. 16. 17-18.

²⁹ Platt, *op. cit.*, p. 54.

Heine, this time a Jew reacting to the social-intellectual nexus of his time in a not dissimilar fashion. Between Horace and Heine the likenesses are striking; and on the point of this ironic tone present in both of them Mauriz Schuster³⁰ has this acute observation to make:

Aber auch jene nüchtern-kalte verstandmässige Art der Horazischen Dichtung . . . findet bei Heine—bisweilen die träumerischeste Sentimentalität mancher Verse durchquerend oder abschliessend—recht zahlreiche Parallelen und steht überhaupt mit einem psychischen Grundzug des Heineschen Wesens im Einklange.

There is no claim made that this is in itself a proof that Horace had a partly Jewish descent; but, taken along with a number of other things to which we have been inviting attention, Schuster's is a rather impressive verdict, namely, that the resemblance in the style of the two authors rests on a deep psychological relationship. Nor is the Roman-ness of Horace's Roman poems any argument of a final character against our thesis. The same Heine who reveals strong traces of his middle eastern origins in this highly cultivated irony we have mentioned, gave Germany some poems thoroughly impregnated with national spirit;³¹ and the deep patriotism of writers of Jewish descent everywhere for the land of their political allegiance is too well known to need proof in these sad days when it has earned them no consideration. It must be obvious that Horace's patriotism was not inherited; in a world where there is any process of migration going on loyalties spring up by the accident of birth or of geographical location and sometimes emerge as the result of intensively applied educational processes. If we had no details whatever of Horace's life we should no doubt succumb to the arguments supposedly derivable from his Roman national odes and from what occasional manifestations he makes of what are called distinctively Roman traits of character. But we have details enough to show how foreign he was to the Roman tradition by origin, and, as for his supposedly Roman traits, they could readily be duplicated from national traditions other than those of Rome.

³⁰ "Horaz und Heine" (gymnasial program, Wiener-Neustadt, at end of academic year, 1915-16). This is a most informative article and well documented. The reference is to p. 6.

³¹ Schuster, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

The objection may be raised that it is incredible that Suetonius—inveterate gossip and retailer of scandal that he was—should have missed so good a point as the Jewish race affiliation of Horace's mother, if such affiliation existed. But it must be remembered that Suetonius, in his biographies, missed details—and very interesting details—which are known to us from other sources. Further, I do not think that a partial descent from an *extera gens* would be so intriguing to whisper and giggle over in the third decade of our second century as it would have been, and in Horace's case no doubt was, in the end of the last century before Christ.³² It will also be noticed that Suetonius' *Vita* is almost entirely taken up with the relations of the poet and Augustus, to the exclusion of many things of which we should have liked to hear.

The enigma has been attacked; it remains for the reader to decide how far, if at all, the solution has been advanced. Substantially the thesis is this: that there is a most unnatural suppression in Horace's works of anything that can be called a reference to his mother but that some of the truth leaks out in the expression *ignota matre inhonestus* and its immediate context; that Horace was not popular at Rome and had to listen to a good many unpleasant observations about his *libertinus pater* and also, probably, to aspersions on his maternal ancestry, even though his father and he had to the best of their ability carefully suppressed all reference to it as far as such a thing could be managed; that this unpopularity was due, in part at least, to a strong prejudice against something in Horace, most likely an unpopular racial strain, and that he was made to feel this very acutely because of his enjoying a patronage from the great which a true Roman might more properly have enjoyed; that it is a very notable fact that Horace nowhere alleges that his father was of Italic stock, which would have been an excellent claim to put forward if it could possibly have been substantiated; that his father, therefore, was undoubtedly of foreign extraction and, as all the probabilities in the case show, a Levantine and his mother, about whom a reference could not be so much as even whispered, was, probably enough, therefore of that Levantine stock least tolerable from a Roman point of view at that time, namely, the Jewish; that such a thesis explains satisfactorily certain things in Horace

³² Juvenal's rage in *Sat.* 3 against general racial toleration is an excellent proof of its existence.

himself and throws light on certain literary parallels; and, finally, that there is nothing whatever in the facts of Horace's life as we know them that can be said to be out of accord with the presumptions detailed above.

It may be noted as a last thought that the Jews, though very caustically spoken of by Juvenal and Tacitus, are hardly referred to by Horace. This is certainly not due to any lack of representatives of that race in Rome at the time or to any deficiency of satirizable qualities in those representatives, we may be sure. Horace's references are casual and not unflattering. There is a note on their zeal for proselytizing;³³ but it is used in a simile, without disparagement, and is generally innocuous. The epithet *curtus*, "circumcised," occurs as a modifier of *Iudaei* and in connection with the vulgar word *oppedere*, the whole forming a coarse phrase, but it is put on the lips of a presumable Roman making a crude joke.³⁴ Finally *credat Iudaeus Apella* occurs at the end of a satire, in which the last preceding event mentioned in the Brundisium journey has been a piece of miracle-working at a local shrine.³⁵ If this phrase is an insult, it can only be said that there were hosts of superstitious Romans of all degrees who would be caught within the curl of its lash, nor is anybody more intolerant, in my experience, of the ignorant and unenlightened Jew than an educated and emancipated member of the same race. There is also the statement by the poet to the bore in his efforts to escape from the latter that he has to visit a sick friend "across the Tiber, a long way off, near Caesar's gardens."³⁶ This points to the Jewish quarter of Rome, but I do not know that any deduction can be drawn from the half-desperate, half-jocular remark, since the friend's place of residence would not necessarily establish his national origin. In fact, the remarkable restraint exercised by Horace about the Jews in Rome suggests to my mind a great discretion parallel to his reticence about his mother. The poet was too obvious a racial target himself to think of launching his satiric arrows in the Jewish direction.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
BERKELEY

³³ *Sat.* i. 4. 142-43.

³⁵ *Ibid.* 5. 100.

³⁴ *Ibid.* 9. 69-70.

³⁶ *Ibid.* 9. 18.

THE MID-THIRD CENTURY OF THE CHRISTIAN ERA. II

A. T. OLMSTEAD

PHILIP was killed by the Illyrian Decius in September, 249. "And then one great souled with his mighty son shall fall through craft because of the elder king. After him shall rule powerfully fertile Rome another great souled lord, understanding to fight, from Dacians coming, of number three hundred, he shall be from the letter four [Traianus Decius], but many shall he destroy, and then all his brothers and friends shall the king destroy and kings cut off.⁷¹ But straightway there shall be sudden pillage and murder of the faithful because of the former king."⁷²

Our Sibyl finds the reason for the terrible persecution by Decius of the faithful, the Christians, in the fact that Philip had favored that sect. Eusebius states that Philip actually was a Christian and cites an edifying story of his submission to ecclesiastical authority. He himself had read a letter of Origen to the emperor and another to his empress Severa. The persecution by Decius was due to his personal hatred of Philip.⁷³ The evidence of the Sibyl indicates that more credit should have been given the account of Eusebius than is generally granted.

In Antioch lived a minor official named Mar-yada, the "lord knows," whose name was either transliterated into Greek as Mareades or was half-translated as Cyriades.⁷⁴ He embezzled funds, intrusted him for the purchase of circus horses, was expelled from the local senate, and took refuge with Shahpuhr. By the promise to surrender his native city, where many were pro-Persian, he persuaded Shahpuhr to grant him the title of Augustus. Doubts have been expressed as to the truth of this statement; but the doubters have not taken into ac-

⁷¹ Cf. Syncell. 684.

⁷² *Orac. Sibyl.* xiii. 79-88.

⁷³ Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* vi. 34, 36. 3, 39; Hieron. *De vir. illustr.* iii. 54; Oros. vii. 20. 1.

⁷⁴ Note how in the Shahpuhr inscription the Pahlavik ideogram *MR* is translated *kúpios*.

count the evidence of the Shahpuhr reliefs, dating from after the capture of Valerian in 260, which represent Mareades standing by the side of his suzerain and clad in the imperial garb, while Valerian—the usurper, from the standpoint of Shahpuhr—must humbly kneel.⁷⁶

With Mareades went the king's own son, Auhrmazd, to invade Syria.⁷⁶ He found the frontier wide open. Apparently personal hatred for all friends of Gordian had led Philip to depose Abgar, king of Osrhoene, who ruled Edessa as frontier guard. A generation later his line still was in existence through an "Apgar descendant" named Amru, mentioned as an independent king in the Paikuli inscription of Narseh I.⁷⁷ Doubtless he is to be identified with the Amru ibn Adi who is listed as fourth ruler of the Lakhmid dynasty, still in its Hauran home and not yet removed to Hira in Babylonia, where it became the Arab bulwark of the Sasanid empire.⁷⁸ Decius restored the colonial status to Edessa. The large amount of coinage regularly bearing the name of the Third Parthica, during his reign from Resaina, suggests that here was the center of Roman operations against the Persians.⁷⁹

There has been much dispute as to exactly when Mareades appeared and when Shahpuhr made his great invasion. All would have been quite unnecessary had the evidence of the Sibyl been given proper

⁷⁶ Sprengling, however ("Shahpuhr," p. 372), refuses this identification: "Cyriades is nowhere mentioned, and that explodes another of Herzfeld's fancies. The second figure of a Roman on Shahpuhr's repeated victory monuments can under no circumstances be considered Cyriades; it is the pretorian prefect as chief of staff or simply an aide-de-camp of Valerian. Cyriades was not a creature of Shahpuhr, and Shahpuhr took no active interest in him. Cyriades was simply one of the many pretenders to the Roman throne under Gallienus, son and successor of Valerian. To bolster up his shaky cause he may have claimed some backing from Shahpuhr's great prestige in the East, but neither that, nor anything else so far made clear, is proof that Shahpuhr so much as knew him, let alone taking any active interest in him." Even if we ignore the Sibyl, the evidence of Petrus Patricius, added to that of the Augustan Histories, is quite enough to prove that Mareades *did* carry on campaigns, first, with Shahpuhr's son, then with the shah himself, that he *did* revolt before the death of Valerian, and that he *did* assist in the capture of his native city. That Valerian should have been compelled to kneel while his pretorian prefect or aide-de-camp was permitted to stand in the same imperial costume by the side of his new master is unthinkable. The identification of the standing figure with Mareades is *not* due to Herzfeld; it is already found in G. Rawlinson, *Seventh Great Oriental Monarchy*, I, 91. Johan. Ant. 147 says that Shahpuhr invaded Syria on invitation of its governor, who wished to overthrow the emperor. Of course this is a misunderstood reference to Mareades.

⁷⁶ Poll. *Tyr. Trig.* 2; Malal. xii. 295 f., citing Domninus and Philostratus.

⁷⁷ Herzfeld, *Paikuli*, pp. 118 f.

⁷⁸ Tabari, pp. 24 f.

⁷⁹ Hill, *op. cit.*, pp. 117 f., 127 ff.

consideration.⁸⁰ "There where a crafty man shall summoned come," clear evidence of a considerable anti-Roman faction, "a robber," who embezzled circus money, "from Syria appearing, an unknown Roman," he was only a member of the local senate, "and shall press by craft against a race of Cappadocian men, and besieging, he shall be insatiate for war, then there shall be for you, Tyana and Mazaca, a capture; you shall be robbed, but place yourself beneath a fearful yoke. And Syria shall wail for men destroyed." Although Mareades won much loot on this inroad, he made no permanent acquisitions and was finally compelled to retreat. "But when, escaping from Syria, he shall . . . ,⁸¹ fleeing the Romans through Euphrates' streams, no longer like Romans but wild dart shooting Persians, then the ruler of Italians shall fall in the ranks, smitten by gleaming iron, fulfilling his fate." This is the death of Decius, late in June, 251; therefore the invasion of Hormisd and Mareades must have been in the earlier half of that year.⁸² Presumably the route was by the Zeugma crossing, through the Amanus and Cilician Gates, and by Tyana up the north-south road of Cappadocia to Caesarea-Mazaca and back by the same road.

"But when a eunuch⁸³ king of Rome shall be king, then shall most unstable nations come against the Romans, destructive Ares with his bastard son against the walls of Rome." Our Sibyl is punning in bitter earnest. Trebonius Gallus (June, 251—spring, 253) is called *gallos*, the eunuch priest of Phrygian Attis and Cybele; Gallus, therefore, cannot have a child, his presumed son Volusianus is in reality an illegitimate son of Ares and receives his name from οὔλος, the "destructive," a title of his true parent.⁸⁴

⁸⁰ A. Stein ("Mareades," Pauly-Wissowa, *R.-E.*, XIV [1930], 1744 f.) does cite *Orac. Sibyl.* xiii. 89–102 and 119–36 to give added proof for two invasions, one before, one after, the defeat of Valerian; and this is quoted by Alföldi, *Berytus*, IV, 58; but neither secures exact dating. In *Camb. Anc. Hist.*, XII, 170 f., Alföldi dates the invasion of Hormisd after Valerian's trip to Cappadocia, Mareades leads his army in 258 or 259.

⁸¹ The passage is hopeless; Geffcken's emendation: "He shall flee to Selge" is seductive paleographically but impossible topographically.

⁸² *Orac. Sibyl.* xiii. 89–102; cf. Geffcken, *op. cit.*, p. 60; Rzach, *op. cit.*, col. 2159; Stein, *loc. cit.*; "Messius 9," Pauly-Wissowa, *R.-E.*, XV (1931), 1244 f.; F. S. Salisbury and H. Mattingly, "The Reign of Trajan Decius," *Jour. Rom. Stud.*, XIV (1924), 1 ff.

⁸³ The obviously correct reading of manuscripts VH is γάλλος; Geffcken prefers γ'άλλος, "another."

⁸⁴ *Orac. Sibyl.* xiii. 103–5.

The "most unstable nations" are the Germans, whose invasions almost destroyed the Empire in the west. After killing Decius, the Goths briefly enthroned Priscus, brother of Philip.⁸⁵ Other Germans invaded Asia Minor. Since the days of Alexander Severus the eastern Mediterranean had been ravaged by pirates and the land harried by bandits.⁸⁶ From South Russia the Goths built a fleet and intrusted themselves to the dangerous Black Sea. Pontus and Cappadocia were plundered. The sacred city of Attis and Cybele—Pessinus—was looted, for the "eunuch priest," Gallus, could not protect his own. The moon temple at Ephesus was burned; by her reference to "the Selenian goddess who did not guard her holy temple," the Sibyl proves that all this destruction took place in 251.⁸⁷

"Then also famines, pestilences and mighty thunderbolts, and wars terrible, and anarchies of cities shall come suddenly." Our sources tell of the terrible earthquakes from which Asia suffered, of the pestilence from Ethiopia, which swept the land for fifteen years and of which the co-emperor Hostilianus was a victim.⁸⁸

Nisibis had been recovered by the Romans as coins and chroniclers prove; the date of its recapture by Shahpuhr is not indicated in Western sources, though it had obviously been taken before the great wars. Fortunately, the exact date is given by the Arab Tabari, who, whatever his source, must be right in ascribing it to the eleventh year of the king, 251.⁸⁹

For Shahpuhr's invasion we have hitherto possessed only a few scraps. Our best source, Ammianus Marcellinus, is lost; in preserved sections he tells of the ram used to destroy Antioch, only because it was left at Carrhae on the king's return, of the actor's wife who asked if it was a dream or were the Persians actually in the city, of the arrows shot down from the occupied citadel on the unsuspecting crowds gathered in the theater, of the burning of the city, and of the return of the Persians with booty carried off from the neighboring towns. Li-

⁸⁵ Victor xxix.

⁸⁶ *IGRR*, IV, 598; *OGIS*, 519; *CIL*, III, 14191.

⁸⁷ *Orac. Sibyl.* xiii. 96; Zosim. (i. 28. 1, cf. 26. 1, 27. 1) places this in 252-53 and is followed by Alföldi, *Berytus*, IV, 57, in giving 253; Eutrop. ix. 8; Poll. *Gall.* 6. 2.

⁸⁸ *Orac. Sibyl.* xiii. 106-8; Zosim. i. 26. 2, cf. 36. 1; Poll. *Gall.* 5. 2 ff.; Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* vii. 22. 1; Zonar. xii. 21.

⁸⁹ Tabari, pp. 31 f.

banius repeats an earlier version in which it is the actor himself who cries out: "The Persians are in possession of the town!" Domninus states merely that Antioch, taken at evening, was looted and burned.

Quite a different picture was given by Petrus Patricius. The Persian king with Mareades camped two and a half miles from the city. The "wise" fled, the masses remained, some as friends of Mareades, others hopeful for "new things"—economic and social revolution. His account has not been believed. From Tillemont onward, scholars have argued for two captures of Antioch, whether in 256 and 260 or in 255 and 259; our latest authority increases the number of captures to three. No one thought to cite our Sibyl:⁹⁰

"The Syrians shall fearfully perish, for there shall come upon them the great wrath of the Most High, and straightway an uprising of industrious Persians shall destroy Romans, Syrians mingled with Persians." Petrus Patricius is shown to be right—a large part of the native populace did turn against their Roman masters and take part in the massacres. "But they shall not conquer nevertheless by the almighty divine will. Alas! How many shall flee from the east with their goods [refugees before the Persian advance] to other speaking men; alas, of how many men shall the land drink the dark blood. For this shall be a time in which then the living shall bless the dead, by their mouths calling death beautiful, but it shall flee them."

"But now for thee, wretched Syria, I weep with sorrow. And there shall come to thee a stroke from dart shooting men, dreadful, which thou didst never think would come to thee. There shall come also the fugitive from Rome"; again Petrus Patricius is right, Mareades *was* with Shahpuhr, "bearing a great spear, crossing Euphrates with many myriads, who shall burn thee and treat all things badly"; our contemporary blames the burning of Antioch on the former senator. "Wretched Antioch, but never a city shall they call thee, when through your lack of sense you fall under the spears. But stripping all things and making thee naked, they shall leave thee without roof,

⁹⁰ Petr. Patric. 157; Amm. Marc. xx. 11. 11, xxiii. 5. 3; Liban. *Orat.*, xxiv. 38; Poll. *Tyr. Trig.* 2. 2; Zosim. i. 27. 2, who adds that Shahpuhr could have taken all Asia but preferred to retire with his booty; Syncell. 715; Domninus, in Malal. xii. 295 f. A. Stein (Pauly-Wissowa, *R.-E.*, XIV, 1745) had already refused the date 255–56. Alföldi (*Berytus*, IV, 53) also disproved the date by showing the uninterrupted series of Antioch coins from 253 to 258–59. Triple capture of Antioch (Alföldi, *op. cit.*, p. 54).

without home, but anyone seeing thee shall suddenly weep. Thou too shalt be a triumph, Hierapolis, and thou, Beroea; at Chalcis weep over newly wounded sons."⁹¹

To the Sibyl we may now add Shahpuhr himself: "And we against the people of the Romans hastened, and a force of Romans, sixty thousand, in Barbalissos we annihilated. And the people of Syria and as many peoples as were by it and the surrounding territories, all we burned and laid waste and conquered." The Greek formula *περίχωροι* . . . *ἐκαύσαμεν καὶ ἠρωμώσαμεν καὶ ἐκρατήσαμεν*, repeats almost exactly—what is later to be repeated still more exactly—the old Assyrian formula *alani ša limetišunu abbul aqqr ina išati ašrup*, "the cities with their surrounding territories I destroyed, I laid waste, with fire I burned."⁹² "And on that one expedition from the people of Romans, both castles and cities," and there follows the first list of cities. To each is suffixed *πόλις σὺν τῷ περιχώρῳ*, which repeats the common phrase in the Assyrian annals, *alu X u alani šihruṭi ša limetišunu*, "city X and the smaller cities of their surrounding territories,"⁹³ as the lists themselves were anticipated by the Assyrians.

Many of these cities were correctly identified by Henning, most of the remainder by Sprengling, and their evidence need not be repeated. All that remains is to work out the routes and to fit them into the history. In the case of the Assyrian lists this was comparatively easy,⁹⁴ for they followed rigidly topographic and chronological order; not so with Shahpuhr's scribe Auhrmazd. There will be a run of several names in correct order, then he jumps to another run; at times no topographical order can be detected. Once at least he has transferred a name from the second list to the first. Not always can we distinguish the various Antiochs and Seleucias. Only one method is possible; we must plot them on the map, note the roads on which they fall, and fill out as best we can the remaining blanks on these routes.

The list begins with Anatha, taken by Gordian a decade before.

⁹¹ *Orac. Sibyl.* xiii. 108-30.

⁹² Cf., e.g., Ashur-bani-apal, *Ann.* 70 f. *Domninus* (*op. cit.*) says that all Syria was devastated.

⁹³ E.g., Sennacherib, *Prism*, 35; cf. the similar use of *περίχωρος*, Matt. 14:35; Mark 1:28, 6:55; Luke 3:3, 4:14, 37, 7:17, 8:37; Acts 14:6.

⁹⁴ Cf., e.g., A. T. Olmstead, "The Calculated Frightfulness of Ashur-nasir-apal," *Jour. Amer. Orient. Soc.*, XXXVIII (1918), 209 ff.

Next comes BIRTHA Asporaku, "Fort of Asporaces," for by common scribal error the eye has jumped from the BIRTHA Achuran of the Pahlavik to the next name beginning also with BIRTHA. Neither BIRTHA can be identified with Dura-Europus, which we know from the excavations not to have been captured until two years later; we should have expected that Shahpuhr would now begin its investment did not the excavated evidence contradict this natural assumption. In a sort of appendix to Shahpuhr's list, we do find Dura; its mention at this point would fit well enough the date of capture, 255.⁹⁵

The first BIRTHA is almost certainly the BIRTHA of the geographers, to be identified as the flourishing modern Deir ez Zor, recently captured by the British. The BIRTHA of Asporaces is the fort at the Euphrates narrows, occupied by the Assyrians as Zanqi in the ninth century B.C. and soon to be refounded as Zenobia by the great Palmyrene queen; its magnificent ruins at Halabiya still awe the traveler.⁹⁶

Mention of Sura, well known as a military post on the earlier border, with its direct connections across the desert to Palmyra and Damascus, and the failure to mention Circesium prove that the expedition was led along the desert or southern bank of the Euphrates. At Sura, nearest point to Palmyra, we must place the episode of Odeinat (Odenathus), who sent camels and other gifts to Shahpuhr, with the reminder that he had never fought the Persians. The gift was not humble enough to please the shah, who threw it into the Euphrates—good proof that the episode is to be placed at this time and place—and declared that the Palmyrene chief must come in person, his hands tied behind his back, prepared to make adoration.⁹⁷

All these cities had been taken before Shahpuhr reached Barbalissus, where the Roman force, sixty thousand, was annihilated, entirely new information. With Hierapolis, also mentioned by the Sibyl, where the Pahlavik seems to attempt the native name, Bambuqi in

⁹⁵ A. R. Bellinger, *Excavations at Dura-Europus, Sixth Season* (1936), pp. 470 ff.

⁹⁶ F. Sarre and E. Herzfeld, *Archäologische Reise im Euphrat- und Tigris-Gebiet* (1911), I, 166 ff.; II, 365 ff.

⁹⁷ Petr. Patric. Frag. 2 (de Boor); cf. J. G. Février, *Essai sur l'histoire de Palmyre* (1931), pp. 80 f. Palmyrene relations doubted by Sprengling, "Shahpuhr," 372. Alföldi (*Berytus*, iv, 59) declares that Palmyra must have been taken on the way; our inscription does not list the city. The passage of Petrus Patricius on which he relies actually proves the Euphrates site.

Assyrian, Bambyce in Greek, and modern Membij, the list ceases to follow topographic order. Henceforth, we must follow the route by the map, aided by the Sibyl, and the next stopping place is Batnae, the town of that name which is west, not east, of the Euphrates. This is on the direct road from Edessa to Beroea, which the Pahlavik gives under the older name of Haleb, modern Aleppo, again mentioned by the Sibyl. She also gives Chalcis, as does Malalas; the Pahlavik, however, calls it by its Syriac name, Qinneshre, the Arabic Qinnesrin. From here the direct road was taken to Antioch.

From Antioch a separate raid was directed against Seleucia by Pieria, the seaport of the capital; at the mouth of the Orontes the invaders were under the northern slopes of Mount Casius. Another body of raiders went around the eastern slopes of Pieria, over the Amanus by the high pass of the Syrian Gates, and down to Alexandria, modern Alexandrette, which today is the chief seaport of northern Syria, despite its recent occupation by the Turks. The raid ended with Nicopolis and Germanicia—modern Maraş—on an important road north through the Taurus.⁹⁸

Our Sibyl describes this raid:

Alas, how many, dwellers by steep high Casius, the sacred mount, how many by Amanus, how many Lycus laves, how many Marsyas and Pyramus, silver eddying, for even to the bounds of Asia shall they treasure their spoils, cities make naked, idols drag off, and temples hurl down on much nourishing earth. And sometime to Gaul and Pannonia great sorrow, to Mysians and Bithynians, when shall come the warrior. O Lycians, Lycians, a wolf (*lykos*) comes to lick blood when Sannians⁹⁹ come with city destroying Ares and Carpi approach to fight against Ausonians.¹⁰⁰

From the Persian inroads by Casius and Amanus, the Sibyl has turned to the Germanic invasions of Asia Minor, across the Danube and across the Rhine. Then she refers to their defeat by the Pannonian Aemilianus and their retirement home before the Roman generals.¹⁰¹

"And then in truth the bastard son, by his own shameless boldness, shall destroy a king [Volusianus kills his father Gallus], but at once he

⁹⁸ The curious spellings implied by the Pahlavik Germanicus and by the Parsik Germanisia should be noted.

⁹⁹ Agath. v. 1; Zosim. i. 27.

¹⁰⁰ *Orac. Sibyl.* xiii. 131-41.

¹⁰¹ *Poll. Gallien.* 7. 3.

shall be destroyed because of his impiety. But after him shall rule again another bearing rule by names"; through the quadruple alliteration αὐτ' ἄρξει . . . ἄλλος ἀρχήν the Sibyl makes sure we shall recognize that the name of the new emperor began with A. Of course this is Aemilianus himself, who passed on from his victory over the barbarians to become emperor in the summer of 253. Coins prove he ruled over Egypt and Western Asia, he promised the senate to fight the Persians,¹⁰² "but quickly he too shall fall by mighty Ares, struck by gleaming iron."¹⁰³

With the Sibyl we return to Shahpuhr:

And again the ordered universe shall be disordered, men perishing from pestilence and war. But the Persians for the toil of Ares shall again drive themselves in, maddened by the Ausonians. And then of Romans shall there be a flight. After, straightway, shall come a priest, the all-known, sun-sent, from Syria appearing, and all things by craft he shall accomplish. But then too a city of the sun there shall be, and round about her Persians shall dare fearful threats of the Phoenicians.¹⁰⁴

Shahpuhr gives the march in detail, though the names must be rearranged. He took the direct route from Antioch over the mountains to the Orontes bridge, modern Jisr esh Shughr; but, instead of following the main road to the sea at Laodicea, he passed along the west bank to Seleucia ad Belum, modern Qalaat Mirza. From here it was a very short distance across the Orontes swamps, probably now dry, to Apamia, modern Qalaat el Mudiq; located on a high hill overlooking the Orontes plain to the mountains shutting off the sea, it had been since Seleucid times an important military center, containing at one time the elephant park.

A little higher up the valley was Sinzara, a narrow knife-blade rock at the junction of the Orontes and an affluent; in Amarna days it was Zinzar; Thessalian cavalry just after Alexander named it Larissa from similar citadels in their homeland; but already the older name had come back, and we may still behold the ruins of Sheizar, which belonged to the Muslim friend of Crusaders, the memoir-writer, Usamah.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰² Zonar. xii. 22.

¹⁰³ *Orac. Sibyl.* xiii. 142-46; Klebs, "Aemilianus 24," Pauly-Wissowa, *R.-E.*, I (1894), 545 ff.

¹⁰⁴ *Orac. Sibyl.* xiii. 147-54.

¹⁰⁵ P. K. Hitti, *An Arab-Syrian Gentleman* (1929).

Another short march brought Shahpuhr to Amatha—the biblical Hamath and modern Hama; it is significant that the Greek name Epiphaneia, given by Antiochus Epiphanes, had already disappeared. To the southwest he came to Rephanea, a century earlier the camp of the Roman Legio III Gallica, which commanded roads by the famous temple of Baetocaece to the coast opposite Arvad-Aradus and to Tripolis from Hamath and Emesa. The last certainly located name on the list¹⁰⁶ is Aristian, whose name is preserved in the modern Restan; Aristian is closer to the native name than is the familiar Arethusa, into which it was turned to afford a Greek etymology. Aristian is two-thirds the way down the main central road from Hamath to Emesa. We therefore expect that city to be mentioned next.¹⁰⁷ Emesa is conspicuously missing.

Emesa and its priest no longer ruled the Roman world, as under its citizens Elagabalus and Alexander Severus, but it still had its claimant to the imperial throne. Near the beginning of the third century we hear of a certain Samsigeramus, who bore the ancient name of the former independent kings of Emesa.¹⁰⁸ Perhaps it was his son, who, when Alexander Severus was fighting the Persians, set himself up as emperor under the name Uranius Antoninus; he took his first name from Aphrodite Urania, the Greek form of the Heavenly Goddess who was divine consort of the king-god Elagabalus.¹⁰⁹ Either he, or more probably his son, appears as L. Julius Aurelius Sulpicius Uranius Antoninus on coins of 253–54.¹¹⁰

Local tradition remembered him as Samsigeramus. According to the story told by Domninus, Shahpuhr advanced on Emesa. Samsigeramus, priest of Aphrodite, went out against him with a force of peasants and slingers. When Shahpuhr recognized the sacred garments, he prohibited the soldiers from attacking. Shahpuhr and Samsigeramus met in conference; while they were conversing, a peasant slung a stone which struck the king in the head. When the army saw that the king was dead, it fled.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁶ Dichor, which follows, has not been identified.

¹⁰⁷ So Henning, *op. cit.*, p. 827.

¹⁰⁸ Le Bas-Waddington, III, 2564.

¹⁰⁹ Herodian. v. 3. 9; 4. 7; Victor xxiv; Syncell. 674; Zosim. i. 12; Polem. Silv. 521.

¹¹⁰ W. Wroth, *Coins of Galatia, Cappadocia, and Syria* (1899), pp. 231, 240 f.; Alföldi, *Berytus*, IV, 56.

¹¹¹ Domninus, in Malal. 296.

We may discount the slaying of the king and the reverence to the sacred garments as folk tale, but the main elements in the story—the successful defense by the countrymen and the failure of Shahpuhr to capture the wealthy sacred city—are true. More obscurely the Sibyl tells the same story of the “priest, all-known, sun-sent, from Syria appearing,” who “shall accomplish all things by craft.” The “city of the sun” of the Phoenicians is, then, Emesa and not Heliopolis-Baalbek.

To the new evidence should also be added a Greek rock inscription recently discovered at Qalaat el Haways, northeast of Hamath and on the verge of the desert; no doubt it marks the site of the battle commemorated. Despite a vagueness quite equal to that of the Sibyl, the same story may be made out: “Year 564, when the men [the Persians] exposed themselves to Nemesis, the Hero [Samsigeramus], called upon Kronos, and victory was given to him. Neither the barbarians [the peasants], nor anyone in the vicinity, suffered injury, for he “[Shahpuhr] suffered punishment equal to his crimes.”¹¹² The inscription is dated 564—252—53 of our era—the coins of the pretender of the long name, which should celebrate the victory, are dated 253—54; the Sibyl narrates the invasion just after events of the summer of 253. We can no longer doubt that the attack on the retiring Persians was made toward the end of the summer of 253.

How spectacular is this change of dating may be realized when we recall that Alföldi, in the recently issued *Cambridge Ancient History*, assigns the campaign to the years 258—59, that Henning quotes the “modern historians [who], it seems, agree that the successful defence of Emesa took place, if at all, *after* the defeat of Valerian,” that a great classical scholar called our story an *Apokryph*, a great historian, *märchenhaft*.¹¹³ Thanks to our Sibyl, to Shahpuhr’s unwilling testimony, and to the Qalaat el Haways inscription, the matter is settled.

Ammianus tells us of the return of the Persians with the booty carried off from the neighboring cities and of the ram used to destroy

¹¹² Jean Lassus, *Inventaire archéologique de la région au nord-est de Hama* (1935), pp. 132 ff.

¹¹³ Alföldi, *Camb. Anc. Hist.*, XII, 171; Henning, *op. cit.*, p. 827; A. von Gutschmid, *Kleine Schriften*, II (1890), 223; A. von Domaszewski, *Arch. f. Religionswiss.*, XI, 230, and *Geschichte der römischen Kaiser* (1909), II, 299; cf. Stähelin, “Samsigeramos,” Pauly-Wissowa, *R.-E.*, II. Reihe, I, 2227 f.

Antioch, which was left behind at Carrhae on the retirement.¹¹⁴ His second statement proves that the cities which Shahpuhr lists in north-east Syria were captured on this return, for when arranged on the map in proper order they follow a well-known route from Antioch to the Euphrates crossing at Zeugma, whence the direct road runs to Carrhae. Larmenaza, Pahlavik Armenash, is identified by Dr. Calvin McEwan, former director of our North Syrian Expedition, with the Tarmanazi of the Annals of Tiglath Pileser III.¹¹⁵ Gyndarus is marked by a huge mound still called Jindarez; Cyrrhus was the great city on a difficult hill which formed the capital of the Cyrrhestice; both had been already attacked by the invading Parthians just before our era.¹¹⁶ Doliche, with a side road into Cilicia, was the home of Jupiter Dolichenus, well known from inscriptions of Roman soldiers. Urina—otherwise Urima, modern Urim—was on the Euphrates bank, just above the crossing by the bridge of boats, Zeugma.

A new group of cities is shown to begin by the heading: "And of [Pahlavik, 'in'] Cappadocia." The first is Satala, which since the Flavian reorganization of the frontier had been guarded by the XVI Apollonaris legion. Doman is the Domana to the northeast, the modern Tomna.¹¹⁷ The next city is of uncertain reading, perhaps Artangar¹¹⁸ [Pahlavik Arngly] and is probably the well-known Artangir; it may also be connected with the previously mentioned Artaxanses.¹¹⁹ Suisan, Pahlavik Shushan, is Suissa, just west of Satala. Suidan, Pahlavik Shudan, as Professor John Garstang points out, is Soandos. The list ends with Phreata, "wells"; Professor Garstang draws my attention to the Phreata listed by Ptolemy in Garsauria and to the deep wells observed by modern travelers in this vicinity.

This section is so completely out of touch with the others that we must assume it represents an entirely separate expedition. The leader cannot be in doubt, it must have been the "great king of Armenia,"

¹¹⁴ Amm. Marc. xxiii. 5. 3; xx. 11. 11.

¹¹⁵ With the aid of my colleague, Professor George G. Cameron, I hope soon to publish a new and much restored edition of these fragmentary Annals.

¹¹⁶ Neilson Debevoise, *Political History of Parthia* (1938), pp. 100, 102, 117, 118.

¹¹⁷ Professor John Garstang suggests as alternate location Doman, southwest of Shebin Kara Hisar; the near-by Doman Kaya hints of a rock with ancient relief or inscription.

¹¹⁸ Read by Sprengling "A(?)rtangil(on?)."

¹¹⁹ Capitol. Gord. 26. 6.

Hormisdas Artaxarus. This part of the list represents simply an in-raid from Armenia into Cappadocia; from its position in the list, it might have occurred at a later date, but more probably it was a parallel operation.¹²⁰

The list is closed by the summation: "Altogether thirty seven cities." There was good reason why Shahpuhr gave no cities beyond Zeugma: his retirement was inglorious. Passing by Edessa, he must purchase its neutrality by the gift of all the coined money taken on the raid.¹²¹ At Carrhae he must leave the ram which had destroyed Antioch.¹²²

For the next seven years our inscription is silent. About the summer of 253, while Samsigeramus was driving off Shahpuhr from Emesa, Valerian (253-60) became emperor. He found the Empire in chaos; to meet the desperate situation, for the first time in history the Roman Empire was divided formally by the attribution of the West to his son Gallienus (253-68) as equal Augustus: "There shall rule over mighty Romans two leaders, Ares swift; one shall have the number seventy [Valerianus], but the other three [Gallienus]."¹²³

Leaving Gallienus in the west, Valerian took over the Orient, where he made his appearance in the winter of 253-54.¹²⁴ Antioch was recovered, and restoration was begun.¹²⁵ Apparently the destruction was by no means so complete as our sources would imply, for in 254 began coins from Antioch with such legends as "Safety of the Augusti," "Victory," "Venus the Victor," "Returned Fortune," "Rome Eternal," "Victory of the Augusti."¹²⁶

Already in 254, the Borani had followed the Goths across the Black Sea to raid Asia Minor.¹²⁷ They were driven back by Successianus, the pretorian prefect, who was then summoned by Valerian from

¹²⁰ Korkusiona, Pahlavik Korkusia, can only be Coracesium; but this is on the Pamphylian coast and must have been taken by error from the second list. Chanara, Pahlavik Hanary, has not been identified.

¹²¹ Petr. Patric. Frag. 10 (de Boor).

¹²² Amm. Marc. xx. 11. 11.

¹²³ *Orac. Sibyl.* xiii. 155-57; cf. Wickert, "Licinius 173" and "Licinius 84," in Pauly-Wissowa, *R.-E.*, XIII (1926), 288 ff., 350 ff.; for coinage and chronology of reign cf. A. Alföldi, "Die Hauptereignisse der Jahre 253-261 n. Chr.," *Berytus*, IV (1937), 41 ff.

¹²⁴ So rightly Alföldi (*Berytus*, IV, 55 ff.) on the basis of Zosim. i. 28. 3 and 30. 1; Zonar. xii. 24, and the coins. H. M. O. Parker (*Hist. of the Roman World from A.D. 138 to 337* [1935], p. 167), dates the return to 256-57, comparing the coin legends "Gallienus with his army" (Mattingly-Sydenham, *op. cit.*, V, 1, 39). Besnier (*op. cit.*, p. 171) accepts the same date.

¹²⁵ Zosim. i. 32. 2.

¹²⁶ Alföldi, *Berytus*, IV, 43 ff.

¹²⁷ Zosim. i. 31. 1, 3; 32. 1.

Pityus to aid in the reconstruction of Antioch.¹²⁸ His retirement permitted the Borani to cross again in the spring of 255; and this time they took Pityus and Trapezus.¹²⁹

Dura-Europus, besieged since 253, fell in 255; the exact date is fixed by the newly minted coins of this year found in the purses of the soldiers trapped in the countermine against the Persian mines which finally took the place.¹³⁰ Henceforth the site was never inhabited.¹³¹ By its capture the *limes* along the middle Euphrates had been driven back, and Valerian must organize new *limes*, whose formal limit was marked by the road rebuilt from Palmyra to Resapha and Sura, an anticipation of the better-known Strata Diocletiana. Antoninus Uranius of Emesa had disappeared; Odenathus of Palmyra was soon after made *consularis*, a title he employed on an inscription of 258.¹³²

Other Germans reached Asia Minor in the spring of 256 and burned Chalcedon, Astacus, and Nicaea.¹³³ Valerian sent Felix to protect Byzantium; and he himself left Antioch to aid Bithynia against the northern invaders; he found pestilence in Cappadocia, aided no doubt by the ravages of the Armenian inroad, and returned to Antioch, which he had reached by May, 258.¹³⁴

By at least 255 a second Syrian mint, whose location we shall later discuss, began with the legend "Restorer of the Orient," next, "Faith of the Soldiers"—sure indication of mutiny or at least dissatisfaction of the troops—then, "Public Hope." Despite the capture of Dura, coins with "Victory of the Augusti" were followed in 257 and until 259 by "Parthian Victory." Earlier-used sources give no excuse for this claim; it is confirmed, however, by our Sibyl, "Then also the stately bull, pawing with his horns the earth, and with his two horns stirring up the dust, to a reptile, blue glass in color, shall do much ill, dragging a trail with his scales."¹³⁵

Shahpuhr is also witness that Valerian was in process of carrying

¹²⁸ Cf. Alföldi, *Berytus*, IV, 43.

¹²⁹ Zosim. i. 32. 2—34. 1.

¹³⁰ A. R. Bellinger, *op. cit.*, pp. 470 ff. Here the date is given as 256; the date 255 is fixed by Alföldi (*Berytus*, IV, 58). It is hoped that the strange position of Dura in the Shahpuhr list will be further discussed by M. Rostovtzeff, the excavator of that city.

¹³¹ *Amm. Marc.* xxiii. 5. 8.

¹³² *CIS*, III, 3945; Le Bas-Waddington, No. 2602; J. B. Chabot, *Choix*, p. 55.

¹³³ Zosim. i. 34 f.; Jordan, *Get.* 107 f.; Syncell. 716; Poll. *Gallien.* 4. 7, 6. 2.

¹³⁴ Date, *Cod. Just.* v. 3. 5.; ix. 9. 18; chronology, Alföldi, *Berytus*, IV, 57.

¹³⁵ *Orac. Sibyl.* xiii. 158-61a.

out very extensive operations: "But on the third expedition, when we against both Carrae and Edessa hastened [the Pahlavi uses the biblical Harran and Urhail], "and Carrae and Edessa besieged, Valerianos Kaisar came against us, and with him were from [a long list of provinces] a force of seventy thousand."

The list is not primarily one of provinces, it is a copy of the muster rolls captured after the battle, as is shown by the formula: "From the people of X." There is another bit of evidence to be considered. Contrary to our expectation, the original of Shahpuhr's inscription was not in the Parsik of the homeland, but in the northern Pahlavik employed by the Arsacides, for only at the end of this version do we find the scribe Auhrmazd boasting his name and his good pay.¹³⁶ Taken as a whole, the Greek is a literal, unidiomatic translation of this Pahlavik. In the present list, however, the spelling is regularly Latin, not Greek, and is as regularly reflected in the Pahlavik and Parsik versions, unless an Aramaic form was available.

The list begins: "From the people of the Germans," though the Pahlavik has *Germania*. Near the end of the list we find again: "The people of *Germania*." There can be no doubt that the second refers to the levies from Superior and Inferior *Germania*; the first is the best of evidence that the shah realized perfectly well that the strength of the Roman armies lay in the German *mercenaries*.

No geographical order can be detected for more than a few names, but they deserve repetition as an example of a Roman muster roll: "Rhetia,¹³⁷ Noricum, Daceia, Pannonia, Mysia, Amastris (for Paphlagonia, chief city for province), (Hispania),¹³⁸ Africa, Thracia, Bithynia, Asia, Campania, Assyria,¹³⁹ Lycaonia, Galatia, Lycia, Cilicia,¹⁴⁰ Cappadocia, Phrygia, Syria, Phoenices, Judaea,¹⁴¹ Arabia, Mauritania,¹⁴² Germania, Lydia, Asia,¹⁴³ and Mesopotamia.¹⁴⁴

¹³⁶ Sprengling, "From Kartir," p. 332.

¹³⁷ The pronunciation implied by the Pahlavik *Rishia* should be noted.

¹³⁸ Pahlavik *Aspania*.

¹³⁹ Pahlavik *Asuria*; Greek, by error, *Syria*.

¹⁴⁰ Lost in Greek but assured by Pahlavik and Parsik.

¹⁴¹ Pahlavik *Yutaia* but Parsik *Yehudia*, from Aramaic.

¹⁴² Sprengling originally read the Pahlavik as *Turan*; with this might be compared Zonar. xii. 24, the Moors claim descent from the Medes. Later Sprengling wrote: "it may have to be read *Mvrn*."

¹⁴³ The second *Asia* of the Greek is wrong, the Pahlavik gives *Asnius*.

¹⁴⁴ Pahlavik, according to Sprengling, *Mdyn-Rwtn*; Professor Cameron suggests for the second element *Rauta*, "river." Cf. the modern *Miyanduab*.

"And from the parts there of Carrae and Edessa with Valerianos Kaisar a great war against us arose. And Valerianos Kaisar we with our own hands seized. And the remainder, both the eparch [the pretorian prefect Successianus] and the senators and the leaders, whoever were commanders of that force, all these with hands we seized, and into Persis we led them."¹⁴⁵

Although the defeat and capture of Valerian made a tremendous impression on contemporaries and is often mentioned by succeeding writers, the information they afford is remarkably small. Our usually loquacious Sibyl here deserts us; to the description of the bull goring the serpent, she adds only "But he shall perish."¹⁴⁶ Macrianus is blamed for the difficulties into which Valerian fell, with advance and retreat cut off. The emperor attempted in vain to force his way through the enemy lines. The soldiers suffered from pestilence, hunger, and thirst, quite to be expected if the battle was fought in late June, 260.¹⁴⁷ Valerian is said to have offered a huge sum to buy his retreat; he is also said to have been induced to attend a conference where he was treacherously seized. Another story is that in fear of his rebellious soldiers the emperor gave himself up and promised to surrender the remainder of the army.¹⁴⁸

Some say that Mesopotamia was occupied.¹⁴⁹ Nisibis was certainly taken¹⁵⁰ as was Carrhae, for Odenathus must later win them back. Edessa, on the other hand, though besieged, remained untaken.¹⁵¹

From Edessa it was but a day's march to Samosata at the Euphrates crossing. An officer of Valerian named Macrianus had remained behind in this place and now received and reorganized the troops who

¹⁴⁵ Kaaba, Gr. 23-26.

¹⁴⁶ *Orac. Sibyl.* xiii. 161b.

¹⁴⁷ Late summer, 260 (Alföldi, *Berytus*, IV, 63). He places here a third capture of Antioch, based on the apparent failure of coinage from that city after this date.

¹⁴⁸ Nicostrat. 452 (Jacoby); Poll. *Valer.* 1 ff., *Gallien.* 1, *Tyr. Trig.* 12, 1; 2, 2; Julian. *Caesar.* 315b; Victor xxxi. 5, xxxiii; Festus. 23; Eutrop. ix. 7; Zosim. i. 36. 2, iii. 32. 5; Lactant. *De mort. persecut.* v. 2; Petr. *Patric. Frags.* 3, 9 (3 [de Boor]), 13; Malal. xii. 295 f.; Syncell. 715; Oros. vii. 22; Agath. iv. 23; Chron. Pasc. 508; Cedren. 454; Zonar. xii. 23, best account; Tabari, pp. 32 f.; Elias Nisib. 62.

¹⁴⁹ Hieron. *Chron.*; Oros. vii. 22. 7; Eutrop. ix. 8. 2; Victor xxxiii. 3.

¹⁵⁰ Zosim. i. 9. 3. 1.

¹⁵¹ Petr. *Patric. Frag.* 10 (de Boor); Zonar. xii. 23. Alföldi (*Camb. Anc. Hist.*, XII, 171) gives far too severe an estimate of Valerian.

had escaped from the disaster. To him Shahpuhr sent a certain Caledonius with orders to come to his captive master; Macrianus refused and declared himself emperor (June, 260—October, 261). With him were associated his sons, the younger Macrianus and Quietus. "But a well horned stag [Macrianus] after him [Valerian] shall come, again another [the younger Macrianus], hungering on the mountains [the retirement from Samosata when the Persians crossed the river], striving to feed upon the venom hurling beast [the Persians]."¹⁶²

"And the people of Syria and the people of Cilicia and the people of Cappadocia with fire we burned and we laid waste and we made captive and we seized"; here we have the full Assyrian formula, including *ina išati ašrup*, "with fire I burned." "But in that expedition we seized from the people of the Romans [another long list of thirty-six cities]."

For the campaign in the latter half of 260 which followed Shahpuhr's victory, our data have been even more scanty than previously; thanks to Shahpuhr's list, it is now possible to place each scrap in its proper place, but the process demands no little time and care. Again we plot the names along the roads, from the list and from the classical sources, and fill in as before.

Leaving behind an uncaptured Edessa, since this was to be only a hasty raid, intended to loot towns not visited on his previous expedition, an easy march brought Shahpuhr to Samosata, the nearest Euphrates crossing and the most northerly below the mountains and the Euphrates gorge. If the XXII Legio Flavia Firma was still there in garrison, it was forced to retire. Marching down the west bank of the Euphrates, Shahpuhr must have reached Urina and then Doliche, whose names are not repeated from the former list; he proceeded to the east flank of Amanus, south until the Syrian Gates were reached, then down to Alexandrette, in the first list plain Alexandria, in this "Alexandria which is by Isos" or Issus. That for this *list* the Greek is the original is proved by the incorrect reversal in order of Alexandria and Samosata in the Pahlavik version, also by the strange misunderstanding of *κατ' Ἴσον*; for all his boasting, the scribe Auhmazd could not translate this term and so turns it into two cities, Alexandria and Katusi! Philostratus calls it Alexandria the lesser; he also adds the

¹⁶² Petr. Patric. Frag. 159 (Boissovain); *Orac. Sibyl.* xiii. 162-64; cf. Stein, "Fulvius," 73, 74, 82, Pauly-Wissowa, *R.-E.*, VII (1910), 253 ff.

burning of Rhosus, south of Alexandrette, on the northern slopes of Pieria.¹⁵³ Katabolon, though called a city, is the castle of that name northwest of the Issus Gates, which it guards.

We now enter Cilicia and come to Aegae, also mentioned by Philostratus. Mompsuestia is a better form of the well-known Mopsuestia, then come Mallos and Adana, then Tarsus, listed by Syncellus and Zonaras.¹⁵⁴ After Zephyrin we should expect Soli-Pompeiopolis; its omission confirms the statement of Syncellus that it was attacked in vain by scattered bands. Instead, we find next Sebaste, Elaeussa Sebaste, the modern Ayas, on the coast just before the next city on the list, Corycus; the two are mentioned together by Syncellus as the places to which Callistus returned with his naval force after the successful raid which captured Shahpuhr's concubines; but, as we shall see, this took place on the shah's retreat.

Thus far the list has followed topographical order, the next six names belong elsewhere. After this intruding section, the route continues along the coast, by Celenderis and Anemurion; then we must insert Antioch—not the great capital, but Antiochia ad Cragum—then Selinus. Just beyond Selinus is Coracesium, which doubtless we must transfer from the first expedition to the second.

Shahpuhr was now well within the border of Pamphylia, and we should have expected him to continue on to Side and Attaleia and then, by the route once taken by St. Paul, to ascend the plateau. There is not a hint of such a route, and it becomes clear that the Persians had reached their farthest west at Coracesium and were compelled, probably by a defeat, to return. Seeking another route up to the plateau, they found the Calycadnus gorge. After Antiochia ad Cragum comes Seleucia, this time of Rough Cilicia, which still, as modern Selefke with important Roman ruins, commands the entrance to the ascent. It is followed by Dometiupolis, just off this road in the mountains; the Pahlavik Mustinprusi probably hides the native name.

With Laranda we are on the plateau and in Lycaonia, which Syn-

¹⁵³ Philostrat. 2 (Jacoby); Malal. xii. 297.

¹⁵⁴ Syncell. 716; Zonar. xii. 23. Domninus (*loc. cit.*), says that Shahpuhr dispatched the satrap Spates into Cilicia; we have no other reference to him. Philostratus (2 Jacoby) reports that Cilicia and its cities were burned.

cellus reports was devastated and for the most part destroyed. Here the crossroad from Seleucia of Rough Cilicia on the sea meets the great southeast road along the plateau. Laranda is followed in the list, as it is on the train, by Iconis, Pahlavik Aikondia, strange forms when compared with the Iconium of St. Paul and the modern Konya. This was the farthest northwest; the army then returned to Laranda, for the next important stop on the railroad to the east is Eregli, Hera-clea, mentioned in the list by its older name Cybistra.

The army now left this main road and took the great crossroad north to not-far-distant Tyana, which was not protected by its patron saint, the philosopher Apollonius. Beyond was Caesarea Mazaca. This was a great city, forty thousand in population, and was bravely defended by the general Demosthenes, until a captive physician showed the Persians where it might be taken by night. Orders had been given to capture Demosthenes alive; but, mounting his horse and drawing his sword, he dashed through the besiegers and escaped.¹⁵⁵

But where is Caesarea Mazaca in our list? Not where it has been previously sought, but immediately after Tyana. The Pahlavik reads clearly enough Kisria, almost the modern Kaisary; the damaged Parsik should probably agree. It is when we turn to the Greek that we receive the shock: it is not Caesarea but Mēiakarirē.¹⁵⁶ This is an old friend, spelled letter for letter the same by the great historian Ammianus Marcellinus;¹⁵⁷ but it is located between Amida and Marde, in a valley before the last downfall of the hills about the modern Mardin into the broad Mesopotamian plain! A worse example of false identification could scarcely be imagined, and it is found in the Greek edition.

At last, Shahpuhr had reached *the* Sebastia, modern Sivas. He was not too far from Satala, the goal of his son's expedition seven years before, but he could not go on. Instead of retiring southwest near the east bank of the Halys to Caesarea Mazaca, he turned due south to Comana, which the Pahlavik has confused with homeland Kerman. The route continued south by Cabissus, which might be one of the un-

¹⁵⁵ Zonar. xii. 23; Syncell. 716; invasion of Cappadocia, Philostrate. 2 (Jacoby).

¹⁵⁶ Read by Sprengling "Metakarire."

¹⁵⁷ Amm. Marc. xviii. 6. 10, 10. 1; *Not. dig.* xxxvi. 36; Theophylact. i. 13. 4; ii. 10. 6.

identified towns on the list, and came out by the Sis pass, a favorite route of the Assyrians. Flaviopolis is here given by the Greek as Phlouiada. Next we should have Anazarbas, given by Philostratus. Instead, we have only Castabala and Epiphania, not, of course, Hamath but the Cilician city founded by Antiochus Epiphanes. With Neicopolis, mentioned by Philostratus, we are back on our old road.

In this group, between Flavius and Castabala, is Neronias. Our inscription pushes back half a century the evidence for its existence, refutes the suggestion that it was named for a bishop, and establishes the presumption that it was named from Nero himself. Its location in the list may ultimately fix more precisely this predecessor to Irenopolis.¹⁵⁸ Rhacundia cannot be identified.¹⁵⁹ Birtha is merely the Aramaic word for "fort"; it has no more excuse for being in Asia Minor than Meiakarire. Between Selinus and Antioch (ad Cragum) we find in the Greek Myōn; since it is followed by the usual formula, "a city with its surrounding territory," it is tempting to assume that one of two repetitions of πόλις has dropped out, and that the name was Myonopolis, "City of the Myons." The Pahlavik is read by Sprengling *Mydnprvs*; the second element confirms *polis*, the first should probably be read *Myrn*, Myron. This cannot be Myra, which is in Lycia, the site remains unidentified.¹⁶⁰

Shahpuhr's raid had been successful beyond his wildest hopes, and he had carried off vast spoil:

All these cities, with their surrounding territories, thirty six, and men who were from the peoples of the Romans, from the Non-Aryans, in captivity we led, and among our own peoples of the Aryans, in Persis, and in Parthia, and in Uzene, and in Assyria and among the other peoples by eparchies, where were foundations both of our father and grandfathers and our ancestors, there we settled them. And many other lands did we seek out, and a great name and manly deeds did we do, which here are not written, except these so many, on account of this we ordered to be written, so that whoever shall be after us shall recognize this name and the manhood and the royalty which is ours.

¹⁵⁸ Cf. W. Ruge, "Neronias," Pauly-Wissowa, *R.-E.*, XVII, 1936, 48 f.

¹⁵⁹ Professor John Garstang draws my attention to the similar sounding Rheceta of the Hellespont eparchy, Hierocles, 662, 14.

¹⁶⁰ Kaaba, Gr. 27-30.

In the light of the present, it is amusing to find Romans and Germans called "non-Aryans."¹⁶¹

Shahpuhr evidently considered fortunate those who were removed from non-Aryan to Aryan lands. Zonaras tells of the crowd of captives given no more food than would barely sustain life; how once a day their guards led them to water like cattle; how a gorge impassable for the baggage animals was made passable by the corpses of slain captives.¹⁶²

And then, just as the border was almost in sight, vengeance was taken. Callistus, pretorian prefect of Valerian, otherwise known as Ballista, had retained his office under Macrianus;¹⁶³ he had collected the scattered soldiers and ships; and, while the Persians were wandering about the country seeking loot, he fell upon them suddenly from the sea near Pompeiopolis-Soli. Huge quantities of loot were recovered, and—still greater disgrace—he captured the shah's concubines. Returning with his naval force to Sebaste and Corycus, he destroyed a body of three thousand Persians; Shahpuhr heard the news and hastily departed for home.¹⁶⁴ The mention of Nicopolis by Shahpuhr and Philostratus shows that the shah took the direct route home to the Zeugma crossing and Edessa.

Macrianus and his elder son had marched west to Illyricum, where they were defeated by Aureolus, general of Gallienus, in the spring of 261.¹⁶⁵ After his victory over the Persians, Callistus hastened to Emesa, where Quietus had established his headquarters to watch Odenathus, who had already acknowledged the legitimacy of Gallienus. Odenathus was appointed general of the east and was ordered

¹⁶¹ Kaaba, Gr. 33 ff.; "This time Shahpuhr notes specifically . . . that quite aside from the captured Roman army he carried off non-Aryan, i.e., non-Iranian, or, as we might say, non-Persian peoples in considerable numbers and settled them in what he considered Aryan domain belonging to himself and his forebears" (Sprengling, "Shahpuhr," p. 372).

¹⁶² Zonar. xii. 23.

¹⁶³ This is clearly shown by Howe, *op. cit.*

¹⁶⁴ Syncell. 716, confused; Zonar, xii. 23, no topographical indications. Pollio (*Valer. 4. 3, Tyr. Trig. 15. 4*) attributes the capture of the concubines and the huge spoil to Odenathus; but, from *Gallien. 10. 1 ff.*, it would appear that the Palmyrene did not war against Shahpuhr until 264, though Alföldi (*Camb. Anc. Hist., XII, 174 f.*) begins the Palmyrene attack in 262.

¹⁶⁵ Alföldi, *Camb. Anc. Hist., XII, 173*; L. Homo ("L'Empereur Gallien," *Rev. hist., CXIII* [1913], 1 ff., 225 ff.) has shown that Gallienus, contrary to the picture given by the Latin but not the Greek writers, acted with energy and did much to save the Empire.

to march against Quietus, who was defeated near Emesa. Callistus persuaded the citizens to kill the pretender, whose body was thrown over the walls, and to surrender to Odenathus. On the pretense that the Emesenes had given refuge to the fleeing troops of the pretender, Callistus slew so many that the great rival to Palmyra was almost destroyed (November, 261). Later Callistus himself was put to death.¹⁶⁶

For some time it has been recognized that during this period another mint than Antioch was also coining in Syria. Alföldi attributed this second mint "mit Sicherheit" to Samosata, as the military headquarters of Valerian.¹⁶⁷ It is perfectly true that mints were set up at military headquarters, but there is no proof that Samosata formed the headquarters; topography gives every reason to believe that Antioch itself was headquarters, since Valerian would naturally take the direct road from the capital to Edessa, not the roundabout route by Samosata. The hoard reported by H. Ingholt from Kefr Nebudi near Hamath contains examples of every type from this second mint through the reign of Valerian, but none thereafter; Alföldi is right in believing that it was buried at this date, 260. But this is *not* the date of Shahpuhr's capture of Hamath; therefore, it had not been buried when Hamath was captured in 253.

Furthermore, Alföldi notes a small emission of coins from the second mint which bear the name of Gallienus alone together with the legends "Eternal Rome" and "Restorer of the Orient." These must be dated just after 260. That they could have been issued from Samosata at the very time that city was in possession of Shahpuhr is quite impossible. But the second mint shows also coins of Macrianus, dedicated to the "Unconquered Sun," and of his son Quietus, with dedication to "Preserver Jupiter" and the legend "Victory of the Augusti." In view of the undoubted fact that Quietus set up his own headquarters at Emesa, that city must be the site of the second mint. The dedications to the "Unconquered Sun" would then be, not to Mithra or the Bel of Palmyra, but to Elagabalus of Emesa, as would be that to

¹⁶⁶ Poll. *Gallien.* 3. 1 ff.; *Tyr. Trig.* 14. 1, 15. 4, 18. 1 ff.; Zonar. xii. 24. Date, Alföldi, *Camb. Anc. Hist.*, XII, 173. Coins of Macrianus and Quietus, P. H. Webb in Mattingly-Sydenham, *Rom. Imp. Coinage*, V, Part II (1933), 580 ff.

¹⁶⁷ Alföldi, *Berytus*, IV, 51.

"Preserver Jupiter." The location of the Kefr Nebudi hoard would point in the same direction.

Then shall come one sent by the Sun [Odenathus of Palmyra], a terrible and fearful lion, breathing forth much flame. Then too by great and shameless recklessness shall he destroy the well horned rapid stag [Quietus as son of Macrianus], and the greatest beast, venom hurling, fearful, sending forth many piping sounds [the Persians], and the sidewise moving goat [Callistus], but after him [Odenathus] fame follows; he, however, sound, unhurt, and unapproached [in his desert home] shall rule the Romans, but the Persians shall be weak.¹⁶⁸

Our Sibyl ends her "charming song" with praise of the glorious exploits of Odenathus against the Persians. Included are the war which began in 264, the capture by surrender of Carrhae and Nisibis, the defeat of Shahpuhr near the second town, the pursuit to Ctesiphon, the siege of the capital, the numerous battles with varying success.¹⁶⁹ The "prophecy" of the Sibyl that Odenathus "shall rule the Romans" is very emphatic; despite the lack of epigraphic or numismatic support, her method of expression does verify the hitherto disregarded statements of the Augustan Histories that the Palmyrene actually held the imperium.¹⁷⁰

However well our Sibyl knew her past, she did not know the future. She could not foresee that within a year or two, in 266, her hero would be assassinated, that his son Wahaballat would hold the imperium with the assent of Aurelian and leave behind him coins and inscriptions bearing the appropriate titles, that his widow Zenobia would raise Palmyra to its highest fame and then destroy it, that she would be remembered by thousands who never knew her husband's name. But for us the Sibyl has done invaluable service—she has served as Ariadne.

ORIENTAL INSTITUTE
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

¹⁶⁸ *Orac. Sibyl.* xiii. 164-71.

¹⁶⁹ Poll. *Valer.* 4. 2 ff., *Gallien.* 10. 1 ff., 12. 1, 6, *Tyr. Trig.* 15. 30. 6; Zosim. i. 39. 1; Sext. Ruf. 23; Hieron. *Chron.* 2281; Agath. iv. 24; Procop. ii. 5; Malal. xii. 297; Syncell. 716; Zonar. xii. 23.

¹⁷⁰ Poll. *Gallien.* 1. 1. Odenathus takes the imperium of the east; 10. 1, in 264 Odenathus, king of the Palmyrenes, had obtained the imperium of the whole east; *Tyr. Trig.* 15. 1, the prince of the Palmyrenes assumed the imperium and became king; 12. 1, Odenathus was named Augustus. *CIS*, III, 2946, erected in 271, calls him "King of Kings, Corrector of All the Orient."

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

THE ELECTION OF THE *PONTIFEX MAXIMUS* IN THE LATE REPUBLIC

At least as early as the third century B.C. the *pontifex maximus* was elected from the members of the pontifical college by a special assembly consisting of seventeen tribes chosen by lot from the total thirty-five.¹ By the *lex Domitia* of 104 the election of the regular members of the great priesthoods was assigned to the same assembly which chose the *pontifex maximus*.² In the Sullan reorganization the *lex Domitia* was abrogated, and the choice of the priests was restored to the priestly colleges.³ It is usually assumed that Sulla also restored to the pontifices the right of choosing the *pontifex maximus*, thus abolishing the assembly of the seventeen tribes. But, as Strasburger has pointed out,⁴ there is actually no proof that Sulla interfered with this more ancient privilege of the people. The question is of some interest because it is a practically universal assumption of modern historians that Caesar, when he became a candidate for the priesthood in 63, had first to secure through the *lex Labiena* the abrogation of a Sullan law which placed the election of the *pontifex maximus* in the hands of the pontifices.⁵

¹ For the evidence see Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, II², 27 ff. The earliest election of a *pontifex maximus* recorded is that of P. Licinius Crassus in 212 (Livy xxv. 5. 2-4; cf. xxv. 2.1), at which time the election by the people was already established. The special assembly was probably instituted during the period of Livy's lost second decade (292-219); there is no evidence to support the many suggestions that have been made for a more exact date. The only source for the organization of the assembly is Cicero *De lege agraria* ii. 16-22, 31. Since the assembly consisted of a minority of the people, the vote was not a formal *iussu populi* (cf. De Sanctis, *Storia dei Romani*, III, 1, 349 n.). It must have been confirmed subsequently by another body, presumably the college of pontifices, who under the *lex Domitia* confirmed the election of the pontifices. This seems to indicate that the college had once had the right of choosing the *pontifex maximus* (cf. Dio xlv. 53. 7). Wissowa's suggestion (*R.-K.*², p. 508, n. 11) that the *pontifex maximus* was in early times the oldest member of the college seems improbable.

² Cic. *Leg. agr.* ii. 18-19; *Ad Brut.* i. 5. 3; Vell. ii. 12. 3; Suet. *Nero* 2. On the date of the law see Nicolini, *I Fasti dei tribuni della plebe* (1934), p. 191.

³ Ps.-Asconius, p. 102 Or.

⁴ *Caesars Eintritt in die Geschichte* (Munich, 1938), p. 102 n.

⁵ See, e.g., E. Meyer, *Caesars Monarchie und das Principat des Pompeius*² (1919), p. 15; Cary in *CAH*, IX, 487; Carcopino, *Histoire romaine*, Vol. II: *Caesar* (1936), p. 626. The view that Sulla made no change in the election of the *pontifex maximus* is held by Lange, *Röm. Altertümer*, III (1876), 243 ff., and the possibility is admitted by Mommsen, *op. cit.*, II², 30, n. 6.

Although Caesar's successful campaign is mentioned by Sallust (*Cat.* 49), Velleius (ii. 43. 3), Suetonius (*Iul.* 13), Plutarch (*Caes.* 7), and Dio, the last-named writer is the only one who mentions the *lex Labiena*.⁶ Dio says that the tribune of 63, T. Labienus, had, with the support of Caesar, previously carried a law which restored to the people the right of electing the priests. He goes on to attribute Caesar's support of the law to his desire to secure the supreme pontificate. But he does not say that Caesar's election took place under the *lex Labiena*; indeed, he describes Labienus' law as a renewal of the *lex Domitia*, which, as we have seen, had nothing to do with the choice of the *pontifex maximus*.

Evidence that Sulla had not changed the regulations for electing that officer is, as Strasburger has recently pointed out, to be found in Cicero's account of Servilius Rullus' bill in the *De lege agraria* (ii. 18). The commission was to be elected "item . . . eodemque modo ut comitiis pontificis maximi." The passage implies that the assembly had not been abolished and could still be convoked. Indeed, it is not unlikely that, when Rullus proposed his bill late in 64, Metellus Pius was already dead and that the tribune thought of this method of electing his commissioners because the special assembly was soon to be called to choose his successor. There is a further reason not mentioned by Strasburger for believing that Sulla had made no change in the popular right of electing the *pontifex maximus*. The college usually co-opted a new member as soon as there was a vacancy, while the election of the *pontifex maximus* or, after the *lex Domitia*, of the priests occurred only at a stated time.⁷ Thus when the *pontifex maximus* L. Cornelius Lentulus died in 213, his place in the college was filled in the year of his death, but his successor as *pontifex maximus* was not selected until the following year. If the pontifices had had the right of electing a *pontifex maximus* to succeed Metellus Pius, they would surely have acted immediately before Labienus had time to secure the passage of his law.

Even though Caesar's election as *pontifex maximus* was not carried out

⁶ Dio xxxvii, 37. 1-2: τὰς αἱρέσεις τῶν ἱερέων, γράψαντος μὲν τοῦ Λαβιήνου, σπουδάσαντος δὲ τοῦ Καίσαρος, ἐς τὸν δῆμον αὐθις ὁ δμίλος παρὰ τὸν τοῦ Σύλλου νόμον ἐπανήγαγεν, ἀνανεωσάμενος τὸν τοῦ Δομντίου. ὁ γὰρ Καίσαρ τοῦ Μετέλλου τοῦ Εὐσεβοῦς τελευτήσαντος τῆς τε ἱερωσύνης αὐτοῦ, καίτοι καὶ νέος καὶ μηδέπω ἐστρατηγηκώς, ἐπεθύμησε, καὶ ἐν τῷ πλήθει τὴν ἐλπίδα αὐτῆς, . . . λαβὼν τοῦτο τε ἐπραξε, καὶ ἀρχιέρεως τῶν πομφιλικῶν, . . . ἀπεδείχθη. As has frequently been noted, Dio is mistaken in placing the election at the end of the year, after the execution of the Catilinarians. The evidence of Sallust (*Cat.* 49) is decisive here.

⁷ Wissowa, *R.-K.*, p. 488. After the *lex Labiena*, the *comitia sacerdotum* seem to have occurred regularly between the consular and the praetorian *comitia* (see Cic. *Ad Brut.* i. 5. 4; *Ad fam.* viii. 4. 1). Whether the *comitia pontificis maximi* occurred at the same time is uncertain. The date March 6, often given for Caesar's election and suggested again by Carcopino (*loc. cit.*), is attested only for Augustus (see *CIL*, I, *Comm. diurn.* under March 6). From Cic. *Ad Brut.* i. 5. 4 it appears that at that time a consul and not, as in 212, a newly elected pontifex presided over the *comitia sacerdotum*.

under the *lex Labiena*, we can explain the close association that Dio makes between the law and Caesar's successful contest for the priesthood. Caesar's support of the popular law was a fresh sign of his determination to restore popular sovereignty by removing the restrictions of Sulla. The restoration of the right of electing priests aided Caesar in his candidacy, just as the *lex Domitia* had helped its sponsor, Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, some forty years before to secure first the pontificate and then, a year later, the office of *pontifex maximus*. And Caesar, still a young man competing against two distinguished *consulares*, was using every means, including extensive bribery, to win the election.

The next evidence we have for the choice of the *pontifex maximus* is Dio's report (xliv. 5. 3) that the Roman senate early in 44 voted that Caesar's son, if he should beget or adopt one, should succeed to his office of *pontifex maximus*. The decree, which no one else mentions, has often been explained as a reflection of Octavian's later claims to Caesar's priesthood.⁸ But Dio is usually correct in his records of senatorial decrees and laws. As Münzer has shown,⁹ the claims of ancestry had had great weight with the Roman electorate in the choice of the *pontifex maximus*. Caesar, as we know from his coins, placed a high value on his priestly office, and the servile senate by this decree would have given sanction to a claim such as was familiar to the Roman electorate. But there is no evidence that the decree was followed up by a law which would have confirmed the inheritance of the office.

Before Caesar's adopted son and heir, who as a member of the college of pontifices was eligible, could present himself for the office, a rival among the pontifices appeared on the scene, who also could make a good case for his rights because of ancestry. M. Aemilius Lepidus was the direct descendant of the famous man of the same name who, for a long period in the second century, had been both *pontifex maximus* and *princeps senatus*. Soon after Caesar's death, hirelings of the conspirators are said to have sought Lepidus' support by promising him the office of *pontifex maximus*.¹⁰ But Antony, for whom the aid of Lepidus' army was essential, anticipated any action of the conspirators. Again according to Dio,¹¹ he restored the election of the chief priest to the pontifices, and he himself, doubtless as augur, inaugurated Lepi-

⁸ Mommsen, *op. cit.*, II³, 1106, n. 6; cf. Adcock, *CAH*, IX, 726. The story is accepted by Meyer, *op. cit.*, pp. 524 f., cf. p. 511; Münzer, *Röm. Adelsparteien und Adelsfamilien* (1920), p. 361; Carcopino, *Points de vue sur l'impérialisme romain* (1934), p. 130.

⁹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 359 ff.; for the list of *pontifices maximi* see p. 414. For the story that Iulus, founder of the Julii, was originally a *pontifex maximus* of Alba see Meyer, *op. cit.*, p. 511; Carcopino, *Points de vue sur l'impérialisme romain*, p. 113. It is impossible to determine whether that story is an invention of Caesar or of Augustus.

¹⁰ Appian *B.C.* ii. 132.

¹¹ xliv. 53. 6-7: ἀρχιερία αὐτὸν ἀποδεχθῆναι παρεσκεύασεν, ἵνα μὴδὲν ὧν ἔπραττε πολυπραγμονοίῃ. ὅπως γὰρ δὴ ῥαδίως αὐτὸ ποιήσει, ἔτι τε τοῖς ἱερέας αἰτίαι ἀπὸ τοῦ δήμου τὴν ἀρεσκύν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως ἐπαγγαγε, κἀν αὐτοῖς αὐτὸν οὐδὲν ἢ ὀλίγα τῶν νενομισμένων πράξας ἐτέλεσε, δυνήθεις ἂν αὐτὸς ἱερώσασθαι.

dus as *pontifex maximus*. Just what the procedure was is not clear, though the absence of any evidence for the holding of *comitia* to elect Lepidus makes it likely that Dio is substantially correct. The election could not have been restored to the pontifices without a law, and there is no record of any such legislation. Perhaps this was one of the laws of Antony which appeared engraved in bronze before anyone had ever heard of them.¹² The Augustan historians are undoubtedly right in indicating that the action was illegal.¹³ If Cicero had not been so eager to conciliate Lepidus, he would have included the details of this irregular action in the catalogue of Antony's sins in the *Second Philippic*. The appointment of Lepidus was already settled in July of 44,¹⁴ and his inauguration came at the end of November of that year.¹⁵

When the death of Lepidus in 13 B.C. freed the office which Augustus claimed was his by right of inheritance, the emperor revived republican traditions and on March 6, 12 B.C., held *comitia* for which, as he tells us in his *Res gestae*, a crowd such as no living man could remember came to Rome. The election with only one candidate for the office was, of course, a mere matter of form, but the fiction was continued by later emperors. At least throughout the first century the *comitia* regularly took place after the emperor had entered upon his *imperium*.¹⁶

The popular election of the *pontifex maximus* was not abolished by Sulla when he restored to the priestly colleges the choice of their members. As a candidate before the people for the office of *pontifex maximus* Caesar supported the *lex Labiena* simply as a means of securing popular support for his election. The *comitia pontificis maximi* persisted from the third century B.C. to the Empire in a tradition broken only by Antony's unconstitutional procedure when he arranged the election of Lepidus in 44.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

LILY ROSS TAYLOR

¹² Cic. *Phil.* ii. 97; iii. 30; v. 11-12; xii. 12; Dio xliv. 53. 2-4. Antony may have attributed the change in the law to Caesar.

¹³ Livy *Ep.* 117: "In confusione rerum ac tumultu M. Lepidus pontificatum maximum interceptit"; Vell. ii. 63: "furto creatus"; Aug. *R.G.* ii. 26: "Cepi id sacerdotium aliquod post annos eo mortuo qui civili motus occasione occupaverat."

¹⁴ Cic. *Ad Att.* xvi. 5. 4 (July 9, 44): "O dies in auspiciis Lepidi lepide descriptos et apte ad consilium reditus nostri!"

¹⁵ *Ad Att.* xvi. 11. 8 (Nov. 5, 44): "De Lepidianis feriis Balbus ad me usque ad III Kal." That this passage refers to Lepidus' inauguration as *pontifex maximus* is clear from a passage in the *Third Philippic* (23) which I do not find cited by modern authorities. Cicero is speaking of the senatorial meeting on November 28, the day before that referred to in the letter of November 5: "Cui senatus consulto ne intercederent verabatur (Antonium)? De supplicatione, credo, M. Lepidi, clarissimi viri. Atque id erat periculum, de cuius honore extraordinario cotidie aliquid cogitabamus, ne eius usitatus honos impediretur." The *usitatus honos* was the *supplicatio* (cf. *Phil.* xiv. 11) and the *honos extraordinarius* was the priesthood.

¹⁶ On the election of emperors to the supreme pontificate see Mommsen, *op. cit.*, II², 1106 ff. Tiberius, Nero, Otho, Vitellius, and Vespasian are all known to have acquired the chief-priesthood later than their *dies imperii*.

NOTE ON PHRYNICHUS' *PHOENISSAE* AND
AESCHYLUS' *PERSAE*

In a recent publication¹ James Turney Allen suggests that we should accept, as substantially true, the story of Vitruvius (v. 9) to the effect that in constructing the roof of the Odeum of Pericles the Athenians used for lumber masts and spars taken from the Persians, i.e., the timbers of ships disabled or captured at Salamis. Professor Allen's date for the beginning of the Odeum is ca. 446/5. This raises the question of how there happened to be available to the Athenians a supply of Persian ship timber more than thirty years old. Professor Allen answers this by supposing that this timber had long ago been put to architectural use, to form the *ikria* in the restoration of the theater in 479/8. After these wooden *ikria* had been replaced by stone seats, such of the old ship timbers as were still sound were converted into roof beams for the Odeum. Thus "the reconstruction of the theater and the erection of the Odeum were correlative parts of a single project."

This attractive and reasonable hypothesis is not without wider significance. We know that in 476 Phrynichus produced his *Phoenissae* and that Themistocles was his choregus.² The *Phoenissae* undoubtedly contained an account of the victory at Salamis. One is strongly tempted to combine what we know about Phrynichus' play with Professor Allen's suggestion about the *ikria* in the restored theater. Thus we may suppose that Themistocles was largely responsible for the restoration of the theater, that the use of the Persian ship timbers for the *ikria* was his idea and served as a memorial of Salamis, his greatest achievement.³ The date of the completed restoration will, therefore, have been 477/6, and the first plays performed at the Dionysia of 476.⁴ The resumption of dramatic contests in honor of Dionysus would have been fittingly solemnized by the production of Phrynichus' *Phoenissae*,⁵ which glorified the victory that had made it possible, in more ways than one. Under such circumstances it was quite natural that Themistocles should have been the one to bear the expense of producing Phrynichus' play.

¹ "On the Odeum of Pericles and the Periclean Reconstruction of the Theater," *University of California Publications in Classical Archaeology*, I (1941), 173-78.

² Plut. *Them.* 5. 4, where the title of the play is not given. Bentley was the first to suggest the *Phoenissae*.

³ This is Professor Allen's view and is based on the fact that Vitruvius credits Themistocles with building the Odeum. The combination with Phrynichus is my own. It appears that Simonides made rather frequent laudatory mention of Themistocles (see Plut. *Them.* 1. 3; 15. 2).

It is curious to find in Plut. *Them.* 2. 6 the story that Themistocles' father attempted to dissuade him from entering politics by pointing out to him the *old triremes, lying on the shore, cast aside and disregarded*: "this is how the masses treat their leaders, wherever they seem no longer useful."

⁴ This is questioningly suggested by Schmid-Stählin, *Gesch. gr. Lit.*, II, 174, n. 5.

⁵ This is Murray's view in *Aeschylus: The Creator of Tragedy* (Oxford, 1940), p. 114.

Four years later Aeschylus produced his *Persae*. Its resemblance to the *Phoenissae*, in subject and perhaps in other respects, led Gilbert Murray to suggest⁶ that for a number of years after the Persian Wars a regular feature of the annual dramatic festival was the performance of some play dealing with the wonderful deliverance of the Greeks. This is, of course, largely conjectural,⁷ but it acquires more probability if the restoration of the theater and the resumption of performances in 476 were arranged by Themistocles to be a glorification of the victory at Salamis. That he should have tried to have his great achievement commemorated again in 475, and annually thereafter, accords well with what we know of his behavior in those years.⁸ If such was the case, the discontinuance of the celebration will date from his ostracism, and the *Persae* will have been the last play in a series of five.

Some scholars have found in the *Persae* a deliberate depreciation of Themistocles' achievement and an exaltation of that of Aristides.⁹ This is entirely consonant with what may have been the popular feeling in Athens in the early months of 472, whether Themistocles had already been ostracized or not. One wonders, on the other hand, how well it pleased the young Pericles, who was Aeschylus' choregus in that year.¹⁰ In any case, the view that the *Persae* was politically tendentious is by no means incompatible with Murray's belief that it was one of a series of dramatic celebrations of the deliverance of the Greeks from the Persian attack.

More important than these historical combinations is the extraordinary impression that the *Persae* (and presumably the *Phoenissae* also) must have made on the spectators, if Professor Allen's view of the restoration of the theater is correct. They may, or may not, have felt that Themistocles was being justly deflated when the Messenger said

353 ἦρξεν μέν, ὦ δέσποινα, τοῦ παντὸς κακοῦ
φανείς ἀλάστωρ ἢ κακὸς δαίμων ποθέν.
ἀνὴρ γὰρ Ἑλλήν ἐξ Ἀθηναίων στρατοῦ
ἐλθὼν ἔλεξε παῖδι σὺ κτλ.

Likewise they may, or may not, have seen bouquets for Aristides in the full and glowing account of the capture of Psyttaleia (ll. 441-71), with no aid from

⁶ First, so far as I know, in his translation of the *Persae* (New York, 1939), p. 8; more fully in *Aeschylus: The Creator of Tragedy*, p. 115.

⁷ It is not, however, entirely without foundation; there were other such celebrations (see *Aeschylus: The Creator of Tragedy*, p. 115).

⁸ See Plut. *Them.* 1. 3; 17. 2; 22. 1-2.

⁹ Schmid-Stählin, *op. cit.*, II, 174 ff. We must not fail to observe, however, that in *Pers.* 349 Aeschylus paraphrases what seems to have been a famous remark of Themistocles, to the effect that a *polis* really consists of *men*, not of walls or of territory; cf. Herod. viii. 61 and Plut. *Them.* 11. 4.

¹⁰ *IG*, II², 2318, 9, *sub Menone*. Printed with the ancient argument in the editions of Wilamowitz (Berlin, 1914) and Murray (Oxford, 1937).

any *Alastor* or evil *Daimon*. Regardless, however, of how they felt about these matters, the play must have deeply thrilled them. On that day in the spring of 472 the matchless and magnificent magic of Aeschylus' poetry re-created for them the greatest moments of their lives—the moments in which they wrought, and became aware that they had wrought, the miracle of Salamis. The performance of the *Persae* must have been a splendid experience indeed for that fortunate audience. But if the seats on which they sat were constructed of timbers from the very ships they had defeated at Salamis, the play must have come even closer home to them, with an immediacy that greatly fires the imagination even at this late day. Our effort in reading the *Persae*, more than any other Greek play, should be to transport ourselves to its performance, which was a very special sort of experience for those privileged to be present. We should, therefore, try to react to the *Persae*, so far as we can, as the Athenians did in 472. If the *ikria* at that time were such as Professor Allen supposes, we have an additional imaginative effort to make; every reader of the *Persae* should keep in mind the clear possibility that if he had attended the performance he would have been sitting on seats made from Persian ship timber. Then, when the Messenger tells him

ὑπτιούτο δὲ

419 σκάφη νεῶν, θάλασσα δ' οὐκέτ' ἦν ἰδεῖν,
ναυαγίων πλήθουσα κτλ.,

he can feel under him the solid memorial of that hidden sea. The sad repetitions of the Chorus, singing

558 πεζοὺς γάρ τε καὶ θαλασσίους
ὁμόπτεροι κυανώπιδες
νᾶες μὲν ἄγαγον, ποποῖ,
νᾶες δ' ἀπώλεσαν, τοτοῖ,
νᾶες
πανωλέθροισιν ἐμβολαῖς, κτλ.,

will then have new force for him, along with the mournful ending of the invocation to Darius

677 πᾶσαι γὰρ τῇδ'
ἐξέφθινται τρισκαλμοὶ
νᾶες ἄναες ἄναες,

and the last words sung by the miserable Xerxes

1074 ἰὴ ἰὴ τρισκάλμοισιν,
ἰὴ ἰὴ, βάρισιν ὀλόμενοι.

PINDAR NEMEAN 1. 64 ff.

In Tiresias' prophecy concerning the future exploits of the infant Heracles we find:

καί τινα σὺν πλαγίῳ
ἀνδρῶν κόρῳ στείχοντα τὸν ἐχθρότατον
φᾶσέ νιν δώσειν μόρῳ.¹

The objections to this are many. (1) τὸν ἐχθρότατον is intolerably flat and clumsy. It has led some to suppose that a particular person is meant, such as Antaeus; Farnell even speaks of "the Christian Devil," whoever that may be. But plainly the lines allude to an indefinite number, as ' so often does: Tiresias has mentioned θῆρες, now he talks of ἀνδρες, next he will talk of the Giants.² (2) In the three³ other places where Pindar uses the superlative of ἐχθρός, he gives ἐχθιστος. (3) φᾶσε is found nowhere else in his writings, but φᾶ occurs twice.⁴ (4) δώσειν μόρῳ is poor, though one cannot call it a serious flaw.⁵ (5) Two scholia make a mysterious allusion to wealth.

Here, then, is one of the few remaining places in Pindar where even the wariest may allow himself to offer emendation: τὸν ἐχθρότατον, at least, has the unmistakable hangdog look. Our difficulties will be met by reading:

καί τινα σὺν πλαγίῳ
ἀνδρῶν κόρῳ στείχοντα βιαιοτάτων
φᾶ νιν ὀρθώσειν μόρῳ.

As for βιαιοτάτων, it is to be supposed that the slightly unexpected superlative, together with τινά, led some reader to imagine (see above) that a particular person was meant. He wrote in the margin τὸν ἐχθρότατον, implying: "the singular τινά alludes to the worst of Heracles' human foes, whoever he was." Then his note ousted the metrically equivalent βιαιοτάτων. We might have expected some epithet to strengthen the brief μόρῳ, but any such dative would be practically impossible, because κόρῳ is near and ambiguity would have resulted. As for ὀρθώσειν, it must be observed that any word meaning only "to slay," such as Schroeder's ἀΐστώσειν and Wilamowitz' ἀλώσειν,⁶ is

¹ The MSS read μόρον, which gives crude syntax and cruder sense. Beck proposed τῷ ἐχθροτάτῳ μόρῳ, and μόρῳ is accepted by recent editors.

² καὶ γάρ (vs. 67) must not be taken to identify (as does Schroeder) these last two classes. Bury well explains: "Heracles is represented as a knight-errant against κόρος, and his championship of the gods is one instance: hence καὶ γάρ."

³ *Olymp.* 8. 69; *Pyth.* 4. 99; 11. 26.

⁴ *Olymp.* 6. 49; *Isth.* 2. 11.

⁵ Some support may be found in *Pyth.* 5. 60 f.: ἔδωκ' Ἀπόλλων θῆρας αἰνῶ φόβῳ. As far as idiomatic correctness goes, δώσειν μόρον would be better; Headlam, *Journal of Philology*, XXX, 300 f., quotes *Iliad* ix. 571: παιδὶ δόμεν θάνατον; viii. 166: πάρος τοι δαίμονα δώσω; and Quint. Smyrn. iii. 265 f.: ἀλλ' ἄρα καὶ τοῖς δώσω ἐπεσσυμένους θάνατον καὶ κῆρας ἐρεμνάς. But δώσειν μόρον would not suit this context (see n. 1).

⁶ *Pindaros*, p. 496. He retains τὸν ἐχθρότατον μόρον, "to destroy by the most hostile death."

ruled out because it produces tautology: we need a word that will develop μόρφ. Such is ὀρθώσειν, which answers πλαγίω neatly and repeats an idea frequent⁷ in this ode. The scholiasts' allusions to wealth are perhaps to be explained by a misunderstanding of κόρῳ,⁸ so often connected with ὄλβος.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

GILBERT NORWOOD

A REPLY

27th April, 1942

To the Editor of "Classical Philology"

SIR:

In the issue of *Classical Philology* for January, 1942, appeared a valuable review by Prof. Kirsopp Lake of *Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus* by H. J. M. Milne and T. C. Skeat, published by the Trustees of the British Museum. I should be grateful if you would allow space in which to reply to one criticism which the reviewer levels, not indeed against the authors of the book in question, but against the policy of the British Museum in the binding of the Codex.

I should like, however, first to express the appreciation which the two authors, no less than myself, feel for Prof. Kirsopp Lake's review. It was, if I may say so, by far the most helpful and constructive notice which the volume has so far received, and such dissentient criticism as it contains of views expressed by Messrs. Milne and Skeat will be very carefully considered by them.

It is in regard to the binding of the Codex that Prof. Kirsopp Lake's opinions seem especially to call for an answer; and since I was Keeper of the Manuscripts at the time of the acquisition and in that capacity advised the Trustees to have the manuscript bound, I feel that it is on me that the duty falls of stating the case for this policy.

After quoting the authors' remark that "the process of binding would present such an opportunity for examining the book, both from the technical and paleographical standpoint, as would never occur again," Prof. Kirsopp Lake writes: "Why, after enjoying this opportunity themselves, have they acquiesced in the policy of rebinding the Codex and so prevented all others from seeing it under the same advantageous conditions? To me, at least, it seems certain that a codex such as the Sinaiticus ought not to be bound but kept in a box. This was the policy of the librarian at Leningrad, and the result was that I was able to photograph it under favorable conditions."

It is undeniably true that for certain purposes it is more convenient to handle unbound leaves than a bound volume. But Prof. Kirsopp Lake seems

⁷ Cf. vss. 15, 25, 43, and 61.

⁸ They are referring to that part of our passage—ἀνδρα ἄδικον πλοῦτῳ ἐπαίρομενον: οὐ κατ' ἐβθὸ λόγῳ, οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ δικαίου περιουσιαζομένῳ.

to forget that this is but one side of the position; he ignores another, and in my view even more important, responsibility of a librarian. A librarian's first duty is surely that of conservation: he is responsible for seeing that the treasures committed to his care are preserved safely for the use not merely of contemporary scholars but of an indefinite number of future generations. Only subject to that over-riding responsibility can he make a volume accessible to any individual student or for any particular purpose. Now from this point of view I do not think that there can be any doubt as to which is the preferable policy. The leaves of the Codex Sinaiticus are extremely thin and often very brittle. At every handling there was a risk that portions of the edges would break away, and the vellum was constantly tending to "cockle" and the corners to turn inwards. Moreover it is very much more difficult to guarantee the safety of single leaves than of a bound volume. A collection of unbound leaves must be carefully counted (which, given the fallibility of man, means in effect counting at least twice) every time it is used, and both before and after issue to a reader. And the risk of the theft or loss of single leaves, even while they are reposing in their box, is considerably greater than with a bound volume. I may remind Prof. Kirsopp Lake that when he saw the Codex in Leningrad he was still able to photograph some scraps from Genesis and Numbers. These scraps never reached the British Museum. It is possible that they are still at Leningrad, but I have no information on this point, and we must, I fear, provisionally allow for their disappearance at some date between the photographing and the sale to the British Museum.

There is another consideration on which I would lay no great stress, for it is of a less ponderable kind than the risk of physical loss; but it is worth mentioning and is not without weight for any librarian or bibliophil. The Codex Sinaiticus is not just an article, a mere tool of textual criticism; it is a book, of venerable age and hallowed by its history and associations. It was bound in antiquity and later rebound at least once, and it was by a mere accident of fortune that it came into Tischendorf's hands as a collection of loose leaves. To bind it, even in its imperfect state, with all the skill of the best modern craftsmanship (and Mr. Douglas Cockerell's competence and taste are everywhere acknowledged), will seem to many an act of piety.

I do not forget that, as Prof. Kirsopp Lake remarks, the librarian at Leningrad did not bind the Codex. It is not for me to criticise the Russian authorities, particularly as I do not know whether their policy was temporary only or intended to be permanent. I can only say that each librarian must settle his own problems to the satisfaction of his own conscience. It seems likely that demands for access to the Codex will be more frequent, and the risks of loss or damage consequently greater, in London than at Leningrad. I cannot expect Prof. Kirsopp Lake, whose case is, *from his own point of view*, unanswerable, to agree with the decision of the Trustees, but I ask him to believe that that decision was not taken without full consideration of various points of view. It is perhaps the greatest of human difficulties that we are so often confronted

with a conflict of responsibilities, one of which must be sacrificed to the other; and librarians are no more exempt than their fellow men from this problem.

I am, Sir,

Yours truly,

H. IDRIS BELL

Keeper of Manuscripts

DEPARTMENT OF MANUSCRIPTS
BRITISH MUSEUM
LONDON, W.C. 1

TWO ETRUSCAN INSCRIPTIONS

Being recently in South Hadley for the meeting of the New England Classical Association, I took the opportunity to inspect two brief Etruscan funerary inscriptions now in the Dwight Museum at Mount Holyoke College. To Professor Dow, who called my attention to them, and to Miss Lucy Shoe, of Mount Holyoke, who permitted me to copy them, I am very grateful. According to the records preserved at the Fogg Art Museum in Cambridge, from which the objects bearing these inscriptions are on loan, neither inscription is known to have been published.

A. *Mt. Holyoke Co. I. 11.*—Sarcophagus (2 m. long, 0.48 m. deep, 0.58 m. high), on the lid a recumbent draped female figure, and the inscription on the front edge beneath it, right to left:

alšine [] a . larθal . larθin [

Fogg Museum 27.203A and 55932: "one of eight found at Masarna, Viterbo; . . . in a tomb in the necropolis of this ancient city."

The letters are 0.05–0.06 m. high, standard Etruscan alphabet of Etruria of the fourth century B.C., with $\diamond = \theta$. There is space for about five letters between *e* [and] *a*.

B. *Mt. Holyoke Co. II. 8, Fogg 32, 56.118.*—A small cinerary urn (0.64 m. long, 0.28 m. deep, 0.45 m. high), much damaged; decorated with a winged figure (death?); the inscription reads right to left, and far from certain,

] lrti : šarsin . . ri [

with four letters missing at the beginning and two at the end. Normal alphabet, as far as confidence may be had in much-worn and barely legible letter forms, 0.055–0.06 m. high; ξ is W.

The lexical elements *lrti* and (in A) *larθal*, *larθin* [are too well known to call for comment; *šarsin* . . (in B) seems to be a local name (*Sarsina*), or a personal name of local origin (*Sarsinas*). We have the testimony of Serv. *Aen.* x. 201 to *Sarsinates qui Perusiam considerunt*. But the provenance of the urn (B) is said not to be known. Did it come perchance from Perugia?

J. WHATMOUGH

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

BOOK REVIEWS

Zenon Papyri: Business Papers of the Third Century B.C. Dealing with Palestine and Egypt, Vol. II. Edited with Introductions and Notes by WILLIAM LINN WESTERMANN, CLINTON WALKER KEYES, and HERBERT LIEBESNY. New York: Columbia University Press, 1940. Pp. x+221+7 pls.

The appearance of a new volume of Zenon papyri is an exciting event. The business and personal affairs of this Caunian entrepreneur, Agreophon's son, who knew so well how to exploit for his friends and himself the vast new resources of the realm of the second Ptolemy, are represented by papers of various sorts, the number of which runs into four figures. These reflect his activities for a period of about twenty-five years. Every new text from his capacious archives should be one more piece fitting into the jigsaw puzzle of his life, completing and explaining the picture and resolving earlier problems. But it is precisely the nature of our evidence from antiquity that every new text is itself a problem; and, while the main lines of Zenon's career are reasonably clear, almost every detail is open to varying interpretation. In particular, the identification of Zenon's many correspondents, the classification of their activities, and the determination of their relationships to one another and to the state all present constant difficulties. In this sense the editing of such a volume as the present one becomes a question not so much of fitting pieces into waiting and appropriately shaped holes as of cutting new holes for them, often to the detriment of previous patterns. This task an editor approaches differently according to his temperament. The great English editor, Mr. C. C. Edgar, whose death just prior to the war caused a more than ordinarily serious loss in the field of Ptolemaic papyrology, was of a cautious disposition. While his editing was of the highest order and while his intimate acquaintance not only with the contents but with the physical appearance of the documents makes his positive statements almost infallible, his dry reserve led him to withhold all comment not only on matters which he did not understand but also on many which he did. The reader of the Cairo volume is frequently left to work things out for himself. It remained for others to draw in the outlines of the picture, notably for Professor Rostovtzeff in his *Large Estate*, now twenty years old but still indispensable. Of all the Zenon editors, none has kept so clearly in mind the problems of interpretation as Professor Westermann and his able assistant, Professor Keyes. It is the special merit of their publications, of the Cornell papyri first and then of those in the Columbia collection, that every effort is made to explore the setting of individual texts and to acquaint the reader with the interpretation as they see it—a highly commendable editorial procedure. If the reader disagrees, he is ordinarily provided with the evidence for his disagreement.

This second Columbia volume contains texts of the later period of Zenon's career, from his residence at Philadelphia to his death. A few documents belong to an earlier time. No. 61 was received in Kadesh, and No. 62 may be early too, although the evidence is not conclusive, but the rest date after 255. One, No. 72, which the editors for another reason date early, must belong to the last period, of 241 or later, because of Zenon's description of himself as a Caunian "sojourner" (*παρεπίδημος*); he functioned no longer under the *σκέπη* of the great Apollonius but lived and pursued his business affairs as a tolerated foreign resident and minor capitalist. There is no reason to suppose that there were not other prosperous and useful *παρεπίδημοι* in Egypt, like the noncitizen mercantile class of the Greek cities, *μέτοικοι* or *πάροικοι*; but it is significant that no one else, as far as my memory goes, is so called in the correspondence. Agesagoras, Jason's father, and his brother or cousin(?), Sostratus, may have had such a status, but all but at least a very few of the Greeks were *οἱ παρὰ τοῦ δαίμονος*, a spider-web pattern of society based on radiating lines of sponsors and agents, rarely if ever disconnected from one or another form of government service.

Most of the texts relate to Zenon's business affairs, but No. 60, a little scrap of six fragmentary lines, has a more general interest. It is a memorandum or check list of "books sent down to Epharmostus," Zenon's brother. "Sending down" means that Zenon was at Philadelphia and Epharmostus down river, in the direction of Alexandria if not actually there. That in itself is a notable situation, to which the editors devote too little attention in their otherwise full and admirable commentary. If Epharmostus was in need of "useful" books, *synagogai* of Callisthenes dealing with such public business as "embassies," compendiums of information of the Peripatetic type, the thought is at least tempting that he was studying for some sort of *Staatsexam* in protocol, looking to government service, and was at Alexandria or near by. Why, then, did Zenon send him books and not simply let him purchase what he needed at the greatest center of the book trade then existing? Can it be that Zenon had himself qualified by similar studies and was merely handing down to the younger brother his old textbooks? We can hardly know the answer, but the possibility is interesting. For the rest, this little text is recommended to students of Hellenistic literature. In spite of the editors' exhaustive treatment and their acknowledgment of indebtedness, notably to Dr. Herbert Bloch of Harvard, I cannot feel that the final interpretation has been reached. The editors read and restore *συναγωγή τῶν προ[[ξενίων (?)]] Καλλισθένους [[καὶ τῶν π]ρεσβειῶν*. Possibly the *συναγωγή τῶν Ἡρο[[δότου]* which they also suggest may be better—"notes on Herodotus." In any case, I doubt the following *καί*, if this is a list of titles: either *περὶ π]ρεσβειῶν*, with an indentation for a new item, or *τὰ περὶ*, and the name of the author may well occur in the fragmentary following line.

Of interest for the progress of Hellenism is No. 66, complaining to Zenon of ill-treatment because the writer was a "barbarian" (*ὅτι εἰμι βάρβαρος* and

δοι οὐκ ἐπίσταμαι Ἑλληνίζειν). This type of reference is rare; I have cited a similar instance in a late third-century papyrus of the Yale collection in a review of Peremans' *Vremdeelingen* in the 1940 *Classical Weekly*. It shows that non-Greeks might be discriminated against in the Macedonian kingdoms and has a certain bearing on the "politique de race ou politique impériale" question. Unfortunately in the present instance the name of the writer cannot be made out. The writing, whether his or that of an amanuensis, has not the easy flow of most of the Egyptian writers of this time, resembling more the uncial style of the fourth century (not, of course, in the shapes of individual letters). It would be explained by a foreign origin, and what can be seen of the name, in the excellent photograph supplied by the editors, seems Aramaic. They read only a delta, but I think δαβ is certain, preceded and followed by other letters. The text is puzzling in many ways. The writer was left in Syria by Zenon, neglected by Crotus, and fled to Syria. Is this ineptitude of expression merely, or had he been somewhere else in the meantime? Subsequently Zenon sent him "to Philadelphia," where he was likewise misused by Jason in ways a little hard to follow. His statement is that he was given no oil or grain except at two-month intervals when he received also clothing (was this mistreatment?) and, second, that he was ordered to accept ὄξος—sour wine—as ration. Whatever the meaning of all this, I am inclined to wonder if, in any case, the Philadelphia to which he refers must be Zenon's town in the Fayum. Zenon's interest in the Transjordan is well attested. Cannot this be Rabboth-Amon, the present Amman, and may not the writer's journeyings be from the coastal regions inland, and return? In one minor point it is possible to correct the editors' usually flawless transcriptions. In line 19 they have omitted a $\tau\epsilon$ between $\tau\alpha$ and $\delta\phi\epsilon\lambda\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha$.

No. 83 is an *enteuxis* to the king in a debt case already known from two Cairo papyri published by Edgar. One Nikon had resorted to self-help to collect a debt owed jointly by Antipater and his wife Simon, after they had left Philadelphia and repaired to Hermopolis and opened a shop. This move, in the present text, Antipater explains as having been due to unrelated difficulties with Artemidorus, but one may suspect that trouble was natural to them. Their credit, at all events, is illuminated by the fact that, in borrowing from Nikon, they agreed to pay the usurious and illegal interest of 6 per cent a month. They must have been regarded as a poor risk, and in fact Nikon never did collect from them. When the two disappeared, he endeavored to reach an understanding with a slave of theirs who remained behind, perhaps to wind up their affairs, offering to take the oath by the king as to the original principal. Obviously he could not claim the interest which they had promised him in this solemn and public process. [The editors translate: "Nikon wrote a letter . . . in which he includes the statement, made upon royal oath, that he will draw up an agreement," but that is an awkward translation of $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\phi\epsilon\iota\ \delta\rho\kappa\omicron\nu\ \beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\iota\kappa\acute{o}\nu\ \sigma\upsilon\nu\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\phi\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, and I doubt their assumption of the royal oath in a private letter; the procedure was that of the oath challenge of Greek law.]

Antipater, according to his statement, returned to Philadelphia (attracted by this chance to avoid payment of interest?), but his path was crossed by Nikon, who went to Hermopolis and induced Simon and her son, under threat of the *practor*, to return with him, whereupon he locked them up. Simon had escaped. Antipater now accuses the unfortunate Nikon of two illegalities, the usury (which he had never collected) and the detention of the boy. It is to be hoped that Nikon had sufficient influence to extricate himself from the errors into which his business dealings with this egregious pair had led him.

The little-known subject of the rationing of Hellenistic armies is touched on in No. 89, of 243 B.C., a text which is not easy to understand. It runs as follows: Βασιλεῖ Θεόδωρος Καλλικράτους ἀπὸ τοῦ διαγραφέντος αὐτῷ ὀφωνίου διὰ τῆς ἐν Φιλ(αδελφείαι) τραπέζης ἐμ μηνὶ Ἐπίφ τοῦ δ' (ἔτους) κατὰγοντι εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν τὸν ἐκ Φιλ(αδελφείας) οἶνον, τὸν ἐκ τῶν γεν(ημάτων) τοῦ δ' (ἔτους) εἰς τὴν ἀνάδωσιν τῶν στρατιωτῶν χα(λκοῦ) (δραχμὰς) κ'. The editors explain that Theodore had been to Alexandria and had come back, had been paid, and had returned out of his pay 20 drachmae to the royal account as a voluntary contribution to the soldiers' welfare fund. I doubt this on various grounds. The participle κατὰγοντι is present; Theodore had not yet gone. In view of the relatively low Egyptian salary scale, I doubt if anyone was paid so much for a trip of a month that he could return 20 drachmae without losing money. The whole conception of this enormous (from local standards) and yet casual contribution, made in the bank which had paid him, seems to me modern rather than ancient. Finally, the phrase εἰς τὴν ἀνάδωσιν goes only with violence otherwise than with the immediately preceding οἶνον. It is reasonably clear that the government supplied wine to the troops, whether gratuitously or as a commutation of rations payments. In addition to the *P. Teb.* 724 cited by the editors and some other evidence, an unpublished papyrus of the Yale collection, dated Mesore 29 of year 16, twelve years later than this and likewise in the fall, is a warrant given to persons called *λειτουργοί* by a *toparch* and a *topogrammateus*, certifying that they had given something, now lost, εἰς τὴν καθήκουσαν οἰνικὴν ἀγορὰν τοῦ ιε' (ἔτους) [τοῖς ἐν Φιλαδ]ελφείαι M]ακεδόσιν (corrected from *στρατιώταις*). This may have been a warrant to transport wine, and the situation of the *λειτουργοί* was not dissimilar to that of Theodore, except that he must take the wine to Alexandria. It is hard to be confident in the lack of parallels, and I remember none; but I wonder whether this may not be, after all, an acknowledgment to the king by Theodore of the receipt of 20 drachmae out of his salary, and that he was receiving an advance just prior to his departure. [It is true, of course, that κατὰγοντι has nothing to agree with except βασιλεῖ. Can the "king," that is to say, the administration, have transported the wine *vice* Theodore and been reimbursed therefor?]

I should be exceeding the limits of a review if I entered into a discussion of all the points of interest in these texts. Some details may be briefly added. In No. 64, the recommendation of Zenon may have been to Crotus, and only through him to Nicanor and Hecataeus. Note the use of the singular in the

beginning (*προαγγήγοχεν; αὐτόν*). In No. 70, the reference to an eight-day postponement of the king's birthday celebration need have nothing to do with the calendar, though it is tempting to think so. In No. 75, the income and expense estimates of the estate, 7,000 and 3,800 drachmae, respectively, are interesting, but without further details it is impossible to evaluate the data. It can hardly be that Apollonius drew from his great estate less profit than Nicias from his slaves at Laurium. In No. 76, I suspect that we have a fictitious contract. Athenodorus acknowledges to A and B receipt from C of "the rest of the money paid me for cutting props in the year 38," the document itself being dated year 39. This, combined with the proportionately overlarge promise of amends in case of nonfulfilment, leads me to suspect that A and B had taken over C's interest in an unfulfilled contract and were endeavoring to compel compliance. In No. 77 (verso, ll. 15 ff.), the large payments to Theophilus daily for weeding show that he was a labor contractor, not a workman. In No. 80, the anomalous restoration τοῦ ἀν[δρός] Θρακός, where we should look for a proper name, has been pointed out to me by Professor Rostovtzeff, but I do not see the solution. In No. 85, I doubt very much the restoration of the contract (in the style of *P. Eleph.* 1) as ὁμολογία . . . ἐπὶ τοῖσδε συγγέγραφε. I should look for an ordinary "protocol" or "homology" type. The other difficulties here, both of restoration and of understanding, are heroically faced by the editors, and they have made the best of a bad situation. No. 90 is a sympathetic text to one now in military service. Being caught "short" in the matter of fifteen mattocks can be a calamity. No. 94 suggests a party rather than a wage account, with its *κίναϊδος* and *αὐλητής*; of course, other items are more prosaic. The epithet of the former, *ἰλαρός*, for which the editors adduce no parallels, occurs also at Dura in an unpublished *meretrices* inscription. No. 102, which the editors interpret, I suppose rightly, as an appeal for relief from some obligation because of infirmity, awakens interest because of its line 13:—]. τὰ ὀστᾶ τοῖς παιδίοις. Reference to "bones" young or old is not a normal Greek idiom, if my memory is correct, and one wonders what the context may have been. [Possibly something like τοῦ ἀναιδοῦς Θρακός, "the cursed Thracian"?]

The last four texts in the volume do not belong to the Zenon archives. One is a fragment. Two deal with the estate of the wealthy Irene, whose relations with the government and her lessees are known from texts in *P. Mich.* III. One, No. 120, is of first-class importance, a strip from the left of a royal decree of Euergetes' time (probably) concerning a 2 per cent property tax. This deserves more than a passing mention.

It begins as usual, Βασιλέως προστάξαντος, and continues with infinitives (*ἀπογράφεισθαι, τιμᾶσθαι, τάξ[ασθαι]*), with subjects in the accusative case. After the first of these, the order of topics is reasonably clear: ἐν Ἀλεξ[αν]δρείαι, ἐν δὲ ταῖς λοιπαῖς πόλεσιν—τιμᾶσθαι . . . ὅσον ἀξία ἐστί[ν] (i.e., ἐκάστη οὐσία, and ἀξία is feminine, not neuter plural)—τοὺς μὲν ἐνδημοῦντας—τοὺς δὲ ἀποδημοῦντας. Here, except for the administrative details, there is no obscurity.

"Properties" were to be declared and appraised, and 2 per cent paid *τοῖς τῇν δωρεὰν ἔχουσιν* within certain time limits, different for the "present" and for the "absent." For the problem and history of the *δωρεαί* I need only refer to the admirably full and clear account of the editors. What is meant by the *οὐσία* is more obscure. It is not much of a third-century word and might argue for a later date for the document. The Ptolemaic parallel for the later Roman *οὐσία* was the *δωρεά*, and for private property in land there were the *κτῆματα*, vineyards, etc. Leased property in land can hardly be meant. It is possible to think, in addition to land in some form of private ownership, of capital goods other than real estate—shops, for example. In any case, the properties were such that the owners might be present or absent.

This is an eventuality which may be foreseen in any arrangement about property rights; so in the Teos-Lebedus text to which the editors advert. It is complicated here by the word *στρατευομένων* in line 4, which the editors rightly take to mean "those in the army," not necessarily in the field. This would mean cleruchs rather than mercenaries. They too were to be subject to the tax. What part in the Egyptian tax structure was played by this new imposition is another matter. The soldiers had been taxed before, like everyone else, and like everyone else they might be taxed still more, up to a point. The difficulty is to understand the context in which they are mentioned, in a dative construction which the editors leave hanging, like the dative in the heading of a letter. I remember no instance of this in a *proslagma*, nor do they cite any. Possibly the text began with a *δεῖν* or *χρῆν* or *ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι*. Otherwise the restoration of these lines is not very convincing; I doubt the long series of categories connected by *ἢ*, "[those at home or those] away . . . and the [wives or] parents or brothers or sisters [or sons or daughters.]" Even if the restored persons were completely satisfactory, one would expect "and" rather than "or," especially in the first line where the question is of inclusion, not of an alternative. The truth I do not see; it is another instance of the extreme hazard of long restorations, which rarely satisfy anyone. It is much to the editors' credit that they present the text first without restoration and offer the latter only as an attempt at understanding. So also in line 7 I think that the priests must have been defined as the priests of So-and-so, very possibly of the royal cult. In an official document which laid down exact procedure there could not have been vague reference to "the priests about the city." This is a notable volume, which will provoke much discussion, both now and when times are normal.

C. BRADFORD WELLES

Camp Livingston, Louisiana

Aeschylus and Athens. By GEORGE THOMSON. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1941. Pp. 476. 21s.

Most of us are so absorbed in withstanding the onslaughts made on classical studies from without that we seldom glance over our shoulders at those

members of the garrison who, with the best intentions but little sense of artistic and spiritual values, are sedulously daubing with repulsive ocher the very treasures to whose protection and greater glory we devote our lives: when in a lull of the conflict we turn back from the rampart for renewed inspiration, are we to find in the temples no longer Pallas Athene or cloud-compelling Zeus but brutally hideous idols from Easter Island?

Why should we pursue Greek studies? For the delight, both deep and enduring, that springs from the beauty of literature, plastic art, heroic adventure, suffering and effort; for the illumination shed by thought profound yet tingling with life; for the instruction to be drawn from wars, institutions, political theories successful or disastrous—boons that can never grow obsolete, because the Greeks exhibit the everlasting passions, thoughts, and action of men amid the clear sparkling light of an age less complicated than any that has succeeded it. In a word, we contemplate a civilization glorious and still unique. It is lamentable that the vast extension of knowledge concerning both Greeks and other races, which the last hundred years have brought, should tempt not a few of us to expend so much labor, time, and money not on studying Greece as a glorious and unique civilization but on demonstrating that, if we select the proper period and region, we may depict Greek civilization as less glorious and not unique at all but similar to others, and those often savage, degraded, without interest or stimulus for any child of man. The frequent and wise demand that we should reveal the pertinence of classical studies to our contemporary interests has too often resulted in a tendency to ignore what is alien but valuable: we are less concerned to show how much can be learned from Plato—precisely because he differs from us—than to proclaim that Aetolian peasants (let us say) followed the same marriage customs as our contemporaries in the Solomon Islands.

That delicate and acute mind to which we owe *Greek Lyric Metre* has here, to our distress, strangely produced a work guilty of these perversities, a bulky book three-fourths of which has no real connection with Aeschylus: Aeschylus, that is, in the only tolerable sense of the name—the man who fought at Marathon and Salamis, who wrote our seven plays and the surviving fragments, and who, as Professor Thomson confesses (p. 277), “did not think in terms of social anthropology.” That “the tribe is a multicellular organism which was evolved out of the primitive horde on the basis of a division of labour conditioned by the low level of production” (p. 17), whether the sex of the Erinyes “is explained by the matrilineal institutions of pre-Hellenic Greece” (p. 51), why, in parts of Transylvania, old and sick persons spit on a willow (p. 135), that “in Miami, the mother’s brother’s son is equated with the mother’s brother” (p. 414), what the Swedes say or believe about rebirth (p. 440)—all these and a hundred other such exhibits dredged from the primeval slime are sundered by so deep a gulf from the *Persae* and *Agamemnon* that the author’s insistence on emptying them all so lavishly into his book must repel those who retain a sense of human and artistic values.

That folklore, like comparative religion and other studies not traditionally applied to classical literature, should nevertheless be so applied is on one condition plainly quite legitimate—indeed, most laudable. That condition is that such application shall help us better to understand or appreciate what we read. Elements exist in Greek literature which must puzzle even one who should possess perfect aesthetic sense and complete knowledge of other literature, if he commanded no other qualifications; perhaps the best example is the parabasis of comedy. Knowledge of Greek religion is useful when we come upon Orestes' gross allusion to purification by swine's blood (*Eum.* 280 ff.) or the grotesque transformation of Io into a cow. But little or nothing is gained by mere parallels, less than nothing by a mass of details about Iroquois or Lascars which are irrelevant to the text and give the unwary a notion that Greek tragedy is an ancient *Waste Land*.

When we at length reach Aeschylus on page 245, we find Professor Thomson's preconceived views resulting in judgments sheerly fantastic.

First, he cherishes vigorous opinions about social and political injustice in our own time (pp. 161, 321, 345). I am the last person to quarrel with him on that score, though I doubt the wisdom of such outbreaks in a work of this type. The point, however, is that he has misrepresented Aeschylus. Even if it were true that a Bolshevik pageant in Moscow and "a new opera, the theme of which was inspired by the emancipation of woman consequent on the abolition of private ownership" reveal "the nature of the inspiration behind the *Oresteia*" (p. 297), what other student of Aeschylus could accept such statements as that "Apollo represents in this trilogy [*Oresteia*] the rule of the landed aristocracy" (p. 291)? Others equally astonishing occur elsewhere. On the very first page we read: "The fundamental question which engrossed him all his life was this—how had the tribal society enshrined in those traditions evolved into the democratic city-state which he had helped to establish?" If anything about the poet is clear, it is that he was primarily and most profoundly a religious genius; and, though religion was, of course, far more closely entwined with politics for Greeks than for us, such a statement becomes for that very reason misleading.

Second, obsessed (as has been already remarked) by the notion that we are to explain Greek tragedy by ritual details and folk mummeries, he foists upon quite simple incidents in the plays "solutions" intolerably far-fetched. On page 184 he writes: "What was the origin of the *anagnorisis*? This is a question that no student of Greek tragedy hitherto has even asked." Instead of replying that the *anagnorisis* (by no means a normal element) is merely an excellent *coup de théâtre* which sooner or later would strike any good playwright, he offers "the self-revelation of the god after his rebirth or resurrection." Even Clytaemnestra's *ἐννῆκα* (*Choeph.* 887) recalls "those who have been admitted into the mystical secrets" (p. 189). She is indeed an expert. "With blasphemous audacity she imagines Kasandra as a candidate for initiation, herself

as the officiating priest, and the impending murder as a holy mystery" (p. 262)—all this because of *Ag.* 1050 ff.:

ἀλλ' εἶπερ ἐστὶ μὴ χελιδόνος δίκην
ἀγνώτα φωνὴν βάρβαρον κεκτημένη,
ἔσω φρενῶν λέγουσα πείθω νῦν λόγῳ.

Orestes' acquittal produces this comment (p. 280): "His purification is vindicated as a regeneration. He has died and is born again." The sufficiently obvious idea that the welfare of a community depends on the conduct of its king is dubbed "a primitive notion" based on "the magical functions of the early kingship" (p. 312). Dionysus is earlier (p. 167) said to be "present in the *Bacchants* both in his own person and in that of Pentheus"—a palmary instance of the havoc wrought by reckless hobby-riding: what may have been a truth of primitive religion is stated as a fact concerning a work of dramatic art, where it becomes plainly absurd.

The close of the final chapter seems to me a summary of what is wrong:

The artist leads his fellow men into a world of fantasy where they find release, thus asserting the refusal of the human consciousness to acquiesce in its environment, and by this means there is collected a store of energy, which flows back into the real world and transforms the fantasy into fact. This, then, is the connection between such masterpieces of human culture as Greek tragedy and the mimetic dance, in which the savage huntsmen express both their weakness in the face of nature and their will to master it.

"Transforms fantasy into fact"? Not so! His preoccupation with the social and political development of Athens has blinded him to the basic truth that tragedy deals with *unalterable* conditions. As for the last sentence, even granting a historical connection with the mimetic dance, what does the connection matter? The savage huntsmen no more help us to enjoy and be edified by Aeschylus than the baptism of savage Burgundians helps us to enjoy and be edified by Racine. All this aberration is due to Darwinism. Just when biologists are beginning to look askance at Darwin, he is potently enthroned in scholarship, and our misplaced adoration has made us hunt for origins instead of looking only at products.

That is enough of fault-finding: I leave the reader to assess (for instance) the curious theory of Sophocles' *Electra* on pages 354 ff. and the relevance of the chapter entitled "Athens and Persia." The book contains good things in addition to those warmhearted outbursts, already mentioned, on the social or economic evils that afflict our own time. Concerning the *Eumenides* we read: "Apollo's attitude is transitional. He has challenged the old order, but it is not for him to construct the new" (p. 281). Here is a magnificent note on the close of the *Oresteia*:

It began in the remote and barbarous past, it ends here and now. It is as though at the close of the trilogy he invited his audience to rise from their seats and carry

on the drama from the point where he has left it. Of all the features of the *Oresteia*, the most conspicuous is this organic union between the drama and the community out of which it had emerged and for which it was performed—this perfect harmony between poetry and life [p. 297].

Above all, one substantial part at least of the book has first-rate merit—the disquisition on the *Supplices*, where Professor Thomson's sociology is very much to the purpose and joins with his questing intelligence to produce a lucid and novel account of this difficult play, which proves to rest not only on moral but also on economic and social ideas. His suggestions, too, concerning the lost plays belonging to this trilogy, especially Hypermnestra's trial and acquittal, possess charm and deep importance.

GILBERT NORWOOD

University of Toronto

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, Vol. LI. Edited by a COMMITTEE OF THE CLASSICAL INSTRUCTORS OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: Oxford University Press (Humphrey Milford), 1940. Pp. x+335. \$2.50.

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology. Supplementary Vol. I: *Athenian Studies Presented to William Scott Ferguson*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: Oxford University Press (Humphrey Milford), 1940. Pp. viii+535. \$4.00.

Both volumes are published in honor of William Scott Ferguson, McLean Professor of Ancient and Modern History in Harvard University. These volumes maintain, perhaps surpass, the high standards set by their predecessors in this series. Volume LI contains the bibliography of Professor Ferguson to July, 1940, articles by most of his students who received their Ph.D. degree under his guidance, and summaries of doctoral dissertations presented in 1939-40. The frontispiece is a likeness of Professor Ferguson. Supplementary Volume I contains articles by leading scholars at home and abroad; it contains also a number of illustrations. Both volumes are equipped with an *index locorum*.

Where the feast is so lavish and uniformly excellent as here, it is difficult to pick out individual dishes for special mention. Moreover, no single reviewer could lay claim to a range of knowledge sufficiently wide to speak critically and authoritatively on all the articles. The following brief remarks, therefore, do not represent an attempt to select the outstanding articles; in fact, the present reviewer has no principle of selection at all. First, let us look into Volume LI. Blake (pp. 11-33) deals with some economic difficulties that faced the Byzantine empire in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, as revealed by records of the imperial cloister of Iviron on Mount Athos. This paper is a good example of what can be done by a careful examination of material that is sig-

nificant, though not at all abundant. Boak (pp. 35-60) annotates and translates four papyri found at Karanis in 1924, revealing certain aspects of the collection of taxes in Egypt subsequent to Diocletian's reforms. Hammond (pp. 137-73) here becomes an iconoclast; the old and accepted picture of Septimius is entirely shattered. Septimius relegated Italy and the senate to an inferior position, while he elevated the army to high prominence for practical reasons and not because of personal bias. This article is absolutely convincing. Larsen (pp. 175-213) shows that the Delian League was not formed for the purpose of expanding Athenian power or of permitting her to chart its course. But Athenian leadership was primarily responsible for the decline of the League and the rise of the empire. The League was not responsible for the severance of relations between Sparta and Athens. Truly, as De Witt once said, "History is the evolution of the unintended." Larsen knows more about ancient leagues than any man now living. In his usual thorough manner he has gathered every scrap of material bearing on the question. His article, therefore, is not only a welcome addition to his previous league studies but an example of careful, meticulous, and painstaking scholarship. Pusey (pp. 215-31) shows that the classical Greeks did not possess an altruistic patriotism toward their respective city-states; they were more closely attached to their particular faction than to the state as a whole. Indeed, Maurice Hutton was not wide of the mark when he defined Greek patriotism as "enlightened self-interest, calculating and calculated selfishness" (p. 32 in *The Greek Point of View* [New York, n.d.]).

Next, we may look at the supplementary volume, entitled *Athenian Studies*. Blegen (pp. 1-9) does not reveal new and startling excavations; on the contrary, he draws important conclusions from material already known. In short, he gives prehistoric Athens a higher position than she has heretofore enjoyed. Following Nilsson, he concludes on linguistic grounds that a settlement by the name of Athens existed before 2000 B.C. As to mythology, Attic heroes do not appear in the great Greek sagas, but portions of Athenian myths may well antedate the famous Argive and Theban cycles. As to archeology, remains of Late Helladic I, II, and III have been found in Athens. The Acropolis and the Agora have yielded remains of the Middle and Late Helladic period; other finds indicate a settlement on the site in the late Stone Age. Furthermore, archeological evidence points to the existence of three main cultural and racial layers, belonging, respectively, to the Neolithic Period, the Early Bronze Age, and the Middle Bronze Age. As always, Blegen is reasonable and conservative; he admits that the bulk of the material remains already uncovered is not sufficient to explain Athenian pre-eminence in classical times. He is unquestionably right in asserting that classical Athens owed her greatness to a unique heritage, which is not yet fully known. Mylonas (pp. 11-36) subjects to a careful scrutiny the old theory that Crete dominated, or even conquered, Athens in prehistoric times. He finds that the archeological, lin-

guistic, literary, traditional, and religious evidence does not support this view. If myth and tradition have preserved an element of truth in this matter, they refer to times subsequent to the fall of the Mycenaean Empire. McGregor (pp. 71-95), in discussing party politics at Athens from 510 to 480 B.C., employs for the most part evidence that is already well known from the studies of Munro, Walker, and C. A. Robinson. He makes good use, however, of a recently found (1937) inscription and Meritt's penetrating commentary on it. His conclusion is fourfold: (1) the Alcmaeonidae were always anti-Persian and subsequent to 510 B.C. anti-Spartan as well; (2) the conservative nobility, though friendly to Sparta, was anti-Persian, especially after 510 B.C., and only outwardly tolerant of Athenian tyranny; (3) no group at Athens strongly favored Persia after about 510 B.C.; and (4) when Athens was at peace with Persia, party politics flourished and were influenced by foreign affairs, but threats of war quickly brought Athenian unity and solidarity. This paper is valuable not only per se but also in showing that significant results may come from a fresh and unbiased examination of old evidence. Gomme (pp. 211-45) discusses Pseudo-Xenophon's *Constitution of Athens*. He designates the author as X and wisely refuses to speculate on his identity. From the author's style he draws several conclusions: that he was not one of the authors whose works have survived in Greek literature; that X employed an individual style which was not the product of his age; and that the weak tectonics of the essay show that the writer was not a Sophist himself. As to historical accuracy, X is not trustworthy; in fact, it is not his aim to tell the truth. What he implies is more important to historians than what he says. The date of the essay probably falls between 420 and 415 B.C. The present reviewer feels that Gomme has made notable additions to the researches of Roscher, Müller-Strübing, Kallinka, Stail, Kupferschmid, and Gelzer. Meritt (pp. 247-53) discusses and interprets a most interesting epigraphical fragment of recent discovery. He shows that it originally belonged to the inscription which now appears as *IG*, I², 47. The date is positively 406 B.C. Thus we get a glimpse of Athens in her last frantic efforts to avert the disaster which was soon to come. The fragment is clearly a part of a decree dealing with an Athenian embassy to Sicily for the purpose of consulting with the generals Hannibal and Himilkon. Much in this inscription, as Meritt admits, is ambiguous. Finley (pp. 255-97) bases his belief in the unity of Thucydides' history on the continuity and uniformity of thought found therein. His method is to study the principal ideas of Books vi and vii and then to follow these ideas in Books i-iv. This article will serve as a good antidote to the tenuous ratiocinations of E. Schwartz, Max Pohlenz, and W. Schadewaldt. R. J. Bonner (pp. 299-302) shows that "the view of Gernet and of Glotz that death by hemlock was *suicide par tolérance* must be based on the theory that the Thirty introduced hemlock as a means of execution, for in all other cases, notably that of Socrates, the execution was carried out by the official servants of the Eleven." Bloch (pp. 303-76) examines vari-

ous aspects of historical literature in the fourth century B.C. His long article is divided into three parts: (1) "The *Hellenica of Oxyrhynchus* and Its Authorship"; (2) "Notes on the *Atthis* of Androtion"; and (3) "Theophrastus' *Nomoi* and Aristotle." In his examination of the *Hellenica of Oxyrhynchus* he considers primarily its form, its place in the writing of Greek history, and its existence up to the time when the present copy was made ca. A.D. 200. He reaches the twofold conclusion that the name of the historian cannot be determined and that he certainly cannot be identified with the great writers of the fourth century B.C. The second study deals with De Sanctis' proposal to identify this piece of historical writing with the *Atthis* of Androtion. Bloch's destruction of De Sanctis' chronological assumptions shows that this thesis is not tenable. In his third study Bloch traces a close correlation between Aristotle's *Politeiai*, the empirical parts of the *Politics*, and Theophrastus' *Nomoi*. Jaeger (pp. 409-50) here treats more fully a problem which he had outlined briefly in his *Demosthenes* (Berkeley, 1938). Most modern scholars have assigned to the *Areopagiticus* of Isocrates a date at the close of the Social War, i.e., 355 B.C. The reason for adopting this date lay in the fact that several historical allusions in the *Areopagiticus* seemed to refer to events of this period. Jaeger has shown that the whole atmosphere of the *Areopagiticus* reflects conditions that prevailed in the last period of the second maritime confederacy before the outbreak of the Social War. Definite historical allusions fit into this picture. There can no longer be any doubt about the date: it is the latter half of 357 B.C. Finally, a clear relationship between the ideas of Theramenes and Isocrates is established. Westermann (pp. 451-70) rejects the fantastic figures of the slave population advanced by Athenaeus. He analyzes the entire set of figures in an unbiased manner and proves that Athens and other Greek city-states in the fifth and fourth centuries were not predominantly slave ridden. By way of a reasonable suggestion, Westermann grants that one-fourth to one-third of the total population of Athens may have been in bondage.

Professor Ferguson combines the qualities of a great scholar and a great teacher. His own publications are too well known to require further comment; his bibliography up to July, 1940, contains one hundred and thirty-three items. All but two of his doctoral students have here contributed studies in his honor. Also, his students in conjunction with the Editorial Committee of the Department of Classics (Professors Rand and Pease and Dr. Else) have edited both volumes. Thus Professor Ferguson lives and will continue to live in his former students; truly, no higher tribute can be paid to the inspiration implanted by a great teacher. These two volumes constitute a rich reward richly deserved. In conclusion, the present reviewer would like to extend his felicitations to this eminent scholar and teacher, who has been honored with a two-volume *Festschrift*.

ALFRED P. DORJAHN

Northwestern University

The Temple of Hibis in El Khargeh Oasis, Part II: Greek Inscriptions. By H. G. EVELYN WHITE and JAMES H. OLIVER, with a Preface by H. E. WINLOCK. ("Metropolitan Museum of Art, Egyptian Expedition Publications," Vol. XIV.) New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1938. Pp. xv+71+13 pls. \$3.50.

This work presents the readings of the inscriptions on the Temple of Hibis in the El Khargeh Oasis made by the late H. G. Evelyn White while a member of the Egyptian expeditions of the Metropolitan Museum of Art of New York City, 1909-13, as revised and edited by Professor James H. Oliver.

Thirty-eight of the forty-two inscriptions are short or fragmentary. The time range of the inscriptions is given by No. 7, a dedicatory inscription of Ptolemy II (283-245 B.C.), and Nos. 5 and 6, epigrams of one Hermias who paved an avenue in the temple precinct, to judge by the lettering of the inscription, in the third century A.D. In the second epigram, line 4, Welles's suggestion, ἐπι[απλόους], in his review (*AJA*, XLIV [1940], 264-65), seems to agree better with ἐπτάκι of the first epigram than ἐπι[απόρους]. A late date is also indicated by No. 30, which contains Christian symbolism. It is not clear to me how the editor gets ΧΜΓ from the characters he has traced ΧΤΧΙΙ (last letter possibly Γ), and Evelyn White seems to be nearer the truth when he suggests (καὶ) Τ(ιοῦ) (καὶ) Π(νεύματος). I should guess Χ(ριστοῦ) Τ(ιοῦ) Χ(ριστοῦ) Π(νεύματος).

The important inscriptions are, of course, those containing the edicts of the prefects Gn. Vergilius Capito, Lucius Julius Vestinus (here published for the first time), and Tiberius Julius Alexander. The last edict appears in two copies—the 40 lines of Text A containing only 14½ of the 65½ lines of Text B and essentially the same material as the Berlin papyrus (*BGU*, VII, 1563), which copies to within 1½ lines of the end of Text A with indications that some of the remainder followed. The papyrus agrees with the version, πρὸ πάντων, line 26 of Text A, against πρὸ παντός, line 10 of Text B, although varying in line 30, παρὰ τὸ κοινὸν ἔθος τῶν ἐπάρχων, from the reading common to both Text A, line 29, and Text B, line 11, τῶν ἐπαρχειῶν. It is very likely that the papyrus copied all of Text A shortly after it was cut upon the stone.

The differences between Text A and Text B are unimportant. Text B generally uses iota adscript after ω and η, even when it is not required; Text A has καθ' ὀλίγους (l. 13) in error for Text B's κατ' ὀλίγους (l. 5); it has τὸν . . . ἀδικίαν (l. 39) for the correct form of the article in Text B (l. 14); the plural (l. 26) for the singular of πρὸ παντός in Text B (l. 10) already mentioned; and γεινώσκητε (l. 20) for γινώσκητε in Text B (l. 8). Why Text A was left incomplete is unclear. Evelyn White surmises either because the place "was not sufficiently public" or "there was no place in which to finish it," but these explanations would betoken a strange lack of foresight on the part of the stonecutter.

"The general results of this recension [of Alexander's edict]," writes Evelyn

White, "are limited. . . . In line 62 the new reading *ἐκθέσεων*—which is certain—explains the real subject of this section. Otherwise the corrections produce little more than greater verbal accuracy." The reading *ἐκθέσεων*, however, marks an advance, for in place of the vague *περὶ δὲ τῶν ἀρχαιοτέρων ὑποθέσεων* of Dittenberger's text, "concerning the older complaints," the prefect wrote, "concerning the older tax arrears . . . I shall write to Caesar Augustus," showing that only the emperor had the right to remit arrears of taxes.

Although no other important new readings are offered, the authors, and particularly Oliver, have made a real contribution, not only in their text of Alexander's edict but in the remainder of their work as well, by giving scholars thoroughly reliable information with photographic documentation concerning the precise extent of lacunae; by greater accuracy in indicating line endings, which resulted in part from Oliver's observation that the line was brought to an end with a complete syllable (*οὐκ ὀλίγον*, ll. 29–30 in Text A, and perhaps one other word to be mentioned later, constituting the only exceptions); and by careful readings and excellent restorations. Indeed, the text of Alexander's edict may be said to be established for all practical purposes so far as the readable parts of the inscription are concerned. Scholars who are conversant with the edicts of the prefects, particularly those of an earlier date in which the turns of phraseology were being formalized, may now proceed to make restorations which will be more than good guesses.

In lines 53–54 of Text B, Professor Welles and I had independently read *ὑπ[ο]γρα[φ]ῆς* instead of *ὑπ[ο]θήκ[η]ς* and had commented upon this reading prior to the appearance of Welles's review, to which reference has previously been made. In a letter to me, Professor Oliver states that he sees no trace of the letter phi. A renewed examination of the plate convinces me, however, that phi should be read at this point. This reading would involve a violation of the rule of syllabic division, since Evelyn White has noted that only three letters are missing at the beginning of line 54.

In line 44 Evelyn White construed, "I will bid the *gnomon* to report to me, and when I have corrected . . . I will issue a more precise decree on the subject." But the "*gnomon*," as we know it, is not an official, as Evelyn White assumed, but a code of the *idioslogos*. Oliver emends by reading *[κείσθ]αι* and by putting a full stop after *ἐπανορθωσάμενος* and interprets in the sense that the prefect will re-establish rather than amend the *gnomon*.

In lines 46–47 Oliver fills out the lacunae *ὅτι πο<λλ>ὰ καὶ ὧς κατεκρίθησα[ν, οὐ διὰ κακουργήματα [ἀλλὰ] διὰ τελέσματα σιτικά καὶ ἀργυρικά*—an excellent restoration. Less satisfactory is *ἐκ τῶν ἀγορῶν* in line 50, in the sense of *conventus*. One misses the qualifying word which accompanies *ἀγορά* in its infrequent use with this meaning, e.g., *ἀγορὰ βήματος* in *Oxy.* 237, VII, 20.

Evelyn White's reading of *καὶ τὸ <ι>σ[ον]* in line 54 confirms Wilcken's

brilliant suggestion made in 1903. Oliver's proposal to supply [τὸ καθ'ἐκτον, in lines 58-59, while by no means conclusive, is an advance over earlier conjectures.

Great credit is due Oliver for his exact and conscientious work on the edict of Capito, especially in reconstructing the extent of the lacunae in lines 38-64, which differ from Evelyn White's estimates by from two to eight letters in a line. Many new readings are given, particularly in the mutilated columns III and IV, but it is a disquieting fact that the readings which Jouguet published in 1936 on the basis of an examination of the original inscription "diverge widely from ours," to use Oliver's words. But Jouguet's text bears evidence, as Oliver points out, of the cursory nature of Jouguet's study of the original and his lack of care in calculating lacunae and in proofreading. In some cases in which Evelyn White and Jouguet differ in their readings, Oliver feels that the photograph prepared by the Metropolitan Museum definitely confirms the one or the other; in all disputed cases, one should like to have the results of another examination of the original stone.

The decree of Vestinus with covering documents is 52 lines in length, of which 16 lines and larger parts of others have been lost through erosion. In the extant portions there is a tantalizing omission of suggestive words. Oliver has supplied a surprisingly large number of readings and corrections of Evelyn White's readings from a photograph of the inscription made in 1927, among others the reading of the date of the edict, the sixth year of Nero.

The subject of the edict remains uncertain, but the readings ἐν[όρια] (l. 17), ἐν[όρ]ια (l. 21), and [ἐν]ορία (l. 25)¹ would indicate something about districts or boundaries. But both ἐν[όριος] and ἐνορία strike one as strange. The words are not given in the Index of Dittenberger, and Preisigke lists the first use of ἐνορία in a papyrus of the fourth century. Maspero contributed the restoration [θῆ]λυ in line 23 and suggested that cattle formed a part of the subject of the edict.

From its grouping with the edicts of Capito and Alexander, however, we may be certain that this edict also dealt with the same general subject—taxation. Indeed, in his edict Alexander refers (ll. 28 ff.) to an edict of Vestinus which provided that those who had purchased estates from the fiscus should not be required to pay rentals (ἐκφόρια, ll. 30, 32) upon them but only τὰ καθήκοντα τελεῖσθαι (l. 30). The prefect Flaccus first imposed the rental upon lands which had passed from the holdings of the state into private hands (ll. 26 ff. of Alexander's edict), and it was exacted from his time until Claudius wrote to the prefect Postumus, doing away with the tax. Both Balbillus and Vestinus confirmed the action of Postumus, and Alexander stated that he followed their decisions.

¹ The accent of the last word is the accent of the feminine noun, the only form of the word which Preisigke recognizes; the other two occurrences are apparently taken as the neuter plural of the adjective, ἐν[όριος]-ον, which Liddell-Scott-Jones quote from Pollux (ii. s. A.D.) and Heliodorus, *scriptor eroticus* (iii s. A.D.).

I have elsewhere (*TAPA*, XLV [1934], 248-59) argued for the periodicity of a prefectural edict which ruled on matters of taxation, suggesting that the interval corresponded with the *lustrum*. On the basis of the statement in Alexander's edict, I posited an edict for each of the prefects mentioned, including Vestinus, a position partially confirmed by the publication of this hitherto unknown edict of Vestinus, and showed that the beginning of a *lustrum* fell within the period of office of each of them and that the edicts of Capito and of Alexander were issued in the very year marking the beginning of a *lustrum*. The date of Vestinus' edict, 59/60, marks the beginning of a *lustrum*, the only beginning of a *lustrum* falling within Vestinus' term of office. I believe it may be confidently affirmed that one of the subjects treated in this edict is the remission of rental charges upon private lands originally the property of the state. I should suggest a reconsideration of the possibility of reading ἐκφόρια, at least in lines 17 and 21.

This volume is a handsome publication in folio with beautiful typography, characters to indicate the actual shape and nature of letter tracings, outline drawings, excellent plates, which are of definite assistance in checking the text, a full concordance, and the indexes customary in the completer publications of papyri. Worthy of even greater commendation is the conscientious and scholarly manner in which the work seeks to present the original readings of these inscriptions by giving us the results of the investigator who for the longest period of time studied the originals along with comparisons, evaluations, and corrections of earlier copyists and editors and the many constructive and suggestive comments of the editor, who, working with Evelyn White's manuscript, squeezes and photographs alone, has so often improved upon his readings.

Typographical errors are at an irreducible minimum. Dittography in notes 3 and 4 on page 7, an inverted "n" in "Unpublished" on page 52, and several misplaced accents comprise the total.

O. W. REINMUTH

University of Texas

Laktanz und die Kosmogonie des spätantiken Synkretismus. By KONSTANTIN VILHELMSON. ("Acta et commentationes Universitatis Tartuensis [Dorpatensis]," Vol. XLIX, No. 4.) Tartu, 1940. Pp. 135.

As Karl Gronau observed,¹ Plato and Lactantius are eloquent witnesses to the contradictions that can be brought into a philosophic structure by the attempt to explain the evil of this world. Both had the problem of reconciling visible phenomena with divine goodness: Lactantius had the further problem of reconciling them with certain data of revelation² and of resisting any

¹ *Das Theodizeeproblem*, p. 2.

² Such as Origen summarizes (*De principiis* i praef. 4 ff.). In *Contra Celsum* iv. 65 he asserts that the origin of evil cannot be understood without the story of the devil and of the fall of the angels.

temptation to argue in terms of independent Matter or independent Evil. All things and beings owed not only form but existence to God; all events must be related to divine will and providence. Lactantius wrote in a world which had an interest in cosmogony;³ he was an apologist, not a systematic thinker. He did not see the question in terms of our clear-cut notions of monism and dualism, and he was not primarily concerned with consistency, which could not in fact be obtained save by radical or heretical hypothesis. Similar difficulties arose in the course of Jewish and Persian religious thought,⁴ and analogous solutions may be observed.⁵

Vilhelmson's interesting monograph discusses various contradictory elements in the cosmogony of Lactantius and certain analogies in the Clementine *Homilies* and *Recognitions*; the origins of their dualism in Iranian and Pythagorean (and so-called Iranian and Pythagorean) thought and of their monism, also in Iranian thought (with a counterpart or echo in Orphic literature); the idea of creation out of chaos; the Indian doctrine of the cosmic man and its offshoots here and elsewhere in the classical world; and the Jewish book *Sefer Jesira* (in which Vilhelmson finds Neo-Platonic influence).

These are important and difficult questions, and there is room for disagreement. In particular, the views of Lactantius are perhaps made to appear a little too distinctive.⁶ When he calls the devil a son of God, he goes beyond the normally accepted range of pictorial expression and uses a vivid concept borrowed from Iranian theological speculation; yet, in essence, this is a reaction against anything like thorough dualism—against any idea that the existence of

³ *Jour. Rom. Stud.*, XXVII (1937), 111. Further, pagan gods were frequently set in a cosmic framework (the zodiac, the seasons, the dimensions and levels of the universe): cf. the Parabiago platter, (O. Brendel, *Arch. Anz.*, Vol. L [1935], cols. 521 ff.; A. B. Cook, *Zeus*, III, 1127 f., Fig. 886); E. Peterson, *EIE ΘΕΟΣ*, pp. 241 ff.; S. Eitrem, *Symb. Osloenses*, Vols. IV and V; and G. M. A. Hanfmann's forthcoming monograph in *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*.

⁴ Cf. G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, I, 364 ff., on the condemnation of "two powers in creation"; Genesis, chap. 1, was regarded as unsuitable for immature minds. On Iranian discussions cf. W. Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, p. 140 (for a new translation of the Arabic text there treated see E. Blochet, *Rev. hist. rel.*, XXXVII [1898], 44), and H. S. Nyberg, *Jour. Asiat.*, Vol. CCXIX (1931): in this connection the reader should remember H. H. Schaefer's warning (in Reitzenstein-Schaefer, *Stud. ant. Synkr.*, pp. 237 ff.) against any confident acceptance of the view that the sects described by Schahrastani had a definite existence as such.

⁵ Gronau, *op. cit.*, p. 117, n. 1, quotes Jewish evidence for the arguments (1) that opposites are necessary and (2) that only in face of the possibility of evil does goodness become a merit. For the first in Iranian thought cf. Schahrastani, trans. Haarbrücker, I, 282. On God as creating the "evil impulse" in men cf. H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Komm. z. N.T. aus Talmud u. Midrasch*, IV, 468 ff.

⁶ Cf., in general, Gronau, *op. cit.*; E. Hatch, *Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church*, pp. 217 ff.; E. Schröder, *Plotins Abhandlung Πόθεν τὰ κακά*; A. Miura-Stange, *Celsus u. Origenes*, pp. 72 ff.; Hals Koch, *Pronoia u. Paideusis*, pp. 97 ff.; R. Cadiou, *Introduction au système d'Origène*, pp. 16, 48 ff.; H. Ch. Puech, *Mélanges Bidez*, pp. 745 ff.

personal evil was independent of God and of God's order.⁷ Certainly his linkage of the devil with darkness and with the West was not peculiar; in baptismal liturgies, the renunciation of the devil was regularly made toward the West.⁸

Again, in spite of striking similarities,⁹ the hypothesis of Indian provenance for the cosmic man must remain doubtful; something of the sort appears in fifth-century Greece, and the concept may be part of a common heritage of mythical thinking.¹⁰ On the difficult question of the possibility of religious influences from India, the reader should give full attention to the judicious remarks of A. B. Keith's *Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads* (pp. 601 ff.). We now know that Greeks (at least in India) acquired some knowledge of the Mahabharata and that a source of Trognus had Jain material;¹¹ in the third century Buddha was for Mani a name of the first magnitude, and Bardaisan and Plotinus alike felt the spell of India; and the spade may at any time produce new unsuspected evidence. Yet in what Greek writers (for all their enthusiasm for real or imputed wisdom of barbarians) quote as Indian, the omissions—above all, that of avatars¹²—are remarkable, and it is seldom safe to go beyond *non liquet*.

In any event, this is a useful study, and all who are concerned with the

⁷ For different ideas of two sons of God cf. H. Leisegang, *ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ*, I (1925), 24 ff.; H. Odeberg, *§ Enoch*, *Intr.*, p. 106, n. 1; C. R. C. Allberry, *A Manichaean Psalm-Book*, p. 10.

⁸ F. J. Dölger, *Die Sonne der Gerechtigkeit*, pp. 1 ff.; *Der Exorzismus im altchristlichen Taufritual*, p. 75; *Sol. Salutis*?, p. 307 n. In general, cf. F. C. Burkitt, *The Religion of the Manichees*, pp. 75 ff., and Gronau, *op. cit.*, p. 118, on Augustine's thought. Evil associations are not confined to the West. For the South as the region of death cf. *Historia Josephi* 21 (Tischendorf, *Evang. apocr.*?, p. 132; Michel-Peeters, *Évangiles apocryphes*, I, 224); as the region of evil cf. Cumont, *Rech. sur le manichéisme*, pp. 164 f. (but redemption figures are to appear from this, as from the other directions; A. V. W. Jackson, *Researches in Manichaeism*, pp. 276 f., 286).

⁹ E.g., p. 99: creation from part of the heavenly man in Rig Veda and in Hippol. viii. 13; pp. 119 f.: creation by the vowels and two groups of consonants (Indian), by three Hebrew letters (*Sefer Jesira*); this is notable, but may still be a coincidence, arising from a common preoccupation with the power of the spoken word (in Hebrew creation and Brahmanic sacrifice).

¹⁰ Cf. A. Christensen, *Le premier homme et le premier roi*, I (Arch. ét. orient., Vol. XIV, No. 1), 34; O. Weinreich, *Arch. f. rel.*, XXXIV (1937), 162. Some ideas have their prehistory, as well as their history.

¹¹ W. W. Tarn, *Greeks in Bactria and India*, pp. 380 f., 47.

¹² J. Kennedy, *Jour. Royal As. Soc.*, 1917, p. 474, has an interesting suggestion on El-kasai and avatars. His earlier contention that Basilides adopted Buddhist philosophy (*ibid.*, 1902, pp. 377 ff.) was supported by a formidable array of striking parallels; but an explanation in terms of Platonism (E. de Faye, *Gnostiques et Gnosticisme*?, p. 46) and independent thought fits the general accusation against Basilides and Valentinus, that they followed Greek philosophy rather than revealed truth (De Faye, p. 13). It is very hard to see how Basilides could have learned so intricate a scheme from India. For another view of these issues cf. J. Przyluski, *Mélanges Cumont*, pp. 925 ff.

pentads of elements and qualities which are so common in Persian, Greek, Christian, and Manichee thought, with the concept of the cosmic man,¹³ with speculation on microcosm and macrocosm, with survivals in Judaism of thought such as we find in Philo (e.g., p. 58), with later Orphic literature (e.g., pp. 63, 88 ff.),¹⁴ and with the history of the problem of evil in general may turn to it with profit.

ARTHUR DARBY NOCK

Harvard University

Paulinus' Churches at Nola: Texts, Translations, and Commentary. By R. C. GOLDSCHMIDT. Amsterdam: N. V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij, 1940. Pp. 203. Fl. 4.50.

Since no commentary on Paulinus of Nola has been written since the work of Muratori in 1736 (reprinted in Migne's *Patr. Lat.* LXI), Dr. Goldschmidt, stimulated by Professor A. W. Byvanek's work on the churches at Nola, conceived the idea of publishing the parts of Paulinus which are especially concerned with those buildings, namely *Ep.* 32.10-17; *Carm.* 27. 345-647; and *Carm.* 28 entire. Introductory material includes (I) the life of Paulinus; (II) remarks on the *Natalicia*, or poems on the birthday of Felix; (III) the chronology of the works in question; (IV) a very brief description of the sanctuary of Cimitile; and (V) a description of the manuscripts and editions, largely based on that of von Hartel in *CSEL*, Volumes XXIX and XXX. This arrangement is not entirely satisfactory, since it involves on page 41 a discussion of the readings of manuscripts which (with their symbols) are not described until pages 21-30. There follow, in order, a brief introduction, summary of contents, text (with apparatus criticus), and English translation of each of the three passages; then (pp. 90-91) a collection of *flosculi* in these passages, derived chiefly from Virgil and Ovid and compiled by Goldschmidt from the works of Zingerle and von Hartel. Finally there comes an extensive exegetical commentary (pp. 93-195), followed by a bibliography and index.

The book shows some industry, but its learning suffers from confused exposition and from annoying inconsistencies and inaccuracies. On page 2 the author thanks Mr. John Hook "for his efforts in assisting me to render my

¹³ On one detail he is certainly wrong—his assertion (p. 129) that in Bereschit Rabba on Gen. 11:28 a list of elements culminates in the Son of Man, and his inference that something like the Anthropos doctrine is involved; he has misunderstood *dem Menschensöhne* of A. Wünsche's translation, and the sense is simply "human beings" (H. Freedman and M. Simon, *Midrash Rabbah*, I, 311; Professor H. A. Wolfson has kindly confirmed the point).

¹⁴ The ultimate origin of the pentads of elements here discussed may well be Iranian; but with reference to the list of eight discussed, p. 51, in which either Phanes or Mithras appears, we may note the use of the name of Phanes in Mithraic cult (F. Cumont, *Rev. hist. rel.*, CLX [1934], 63 ff.; cf. Cook, *op. cit.*, II, 1051), which suggests that Orphic formulations perhaps had rather more influence than we might be tempted to suppose: the presence of Nyx in one list clearly points to this.

leaves in tolerable English." Only a few examples of this co-operative English can be here cited: "booking many successes in both these fields" (p. 3); "heavenly roads along lovely brushwood" (p. 41); "an undulating apse unfolds itself" (p. 41); "the omnibenedictory house (*alma domus*)" (p. 43); "as a peaceful bird the Holy Ghost overflows this lamb" (p. 47); "well then, saintly Father, lend me thine ear" (p. 53); "victory covered with salvatory palms those whose glorious bodies have been pierced by nails like beams" (p. 57); "place offers which were not to be burnt, on tables" (p. 141); "the rests found originated from the Holy Cross" (p. 142); "date given by the Chronicles" (p. 148); "it does not seem a big stride from this usage to the meaning presumed by me" (p. 151). Particularly impressive is the 205-word sentence on page 77, where, as elsewhere, one must often consult Paulinus to interpret Goldschmidt. At page 163 ("in case a son is still born after making the testament"), Paulinus unfortunately does not solve the ambiguity!

Certain more strictly philological points may be noted. On page 41 *cubacula* are not necessarily "little rooms," as the editor himself recognizes on page 106. Page 79, "taken from myself" mistranslates *sumptum mihi*. On page 99 sixteen lines are used to explain *stat Christus agno*, but at the end we know neither the meaning of *stat* nor the case of *agno*. On pages 104-5 the evidence for a feminine name *Melanius* seems inadequate. Oblique cases of the word derive more probably from the nom. *Melanium*, for in the passage in Jerome (*Ep.* 39.5. 4), upon which Goldschmidt seems to rely for support, *Melanius* is read by only three manuscripts and is rejected by Hilberg from his text; and, though our editor appeals to von Hartel's index for the use of *Melanius* in Paulinus, an examination of passages cited (which one suspects Goldschmidt has not scanned too narrowly) reduces its occurrence to a marginal variant by the second hand of one manuscript at *Ep.* 31. 1. The editor admits that "no parallels of this masculinization of women's names are known" to him but tries to explain it on the ground that "perfection is unimaginable in female form." The note in which this dictum occurs is more than ordinarily confused in arrangement, as is that on pages 115-16 on the meanings of *aula*. At pages 119-20, where the lemma is *de hac absida aut absidine*—a reading which he "cannot imagine the mss. as offering if it is not correct"—he suggests various ways of meeting the problem of *aut . . . ne*, but overlooks the most natural one that it may be a colloquial fusion of two constructions, *absida aut abside* and *absida absidine*, in which both *aut* and *ne* are retained; cf. similar fusions in Hor. *S.* i.1. 40 (*dum ne*); i.4. 102 (*ut si*); i. 10. 21 (*quine*); also our colloquial "don't hardly know." On page 131 *fuert* does not here mean the same as *fuit*, as he supposes, but refers perfectly regularly to a time antecedent to *crevit*. The phrase *trabales clavi*, on page 143, neither here nor in Hor. *C.* i.35. 18—nor anywhere else, for that matter—means "nails big as beams" (has Goldschmidt really attempted to visualize such?) but simply "spikes," i.e., nails big enough to fasten beams. On page 154 the reference to Ruth 1:1 is inapposite. On pages 157-58 the bold but not impossible figure of speech in

potatur is not clarified by abundant citation of irrelevant uses. "The customary interpretation seems the only possible one. Yet I prefer the other interpretation" (p. 171). Against such courage of conviction mere logic seems futile! Just how "plays upon words" and "puns" differ, so that they must be differently indexed (p. 200), is not clear; perhaps the distinction is as subtle as that between "pillars" and "columns" on page 55. Instances of carelessness are found in the frequent failure of lemmata in the notes to agree with the text; e.g., page 72, where the Latin text reads *Tobit*, but the *apparatus criticus* and the commentary (p. 170) *Tobis*; other examples are found on pages 119, 122, 172, 173, 179. Paulus Silentarius (pp. 126, 127), Eugyppus (p. 195), S. P. Platner (p. 149), and Collosseum (p. 148) seem hardly in their best form. Of the many misprints some are disconcerting, as "you" for "your" (p. 47); "rot" for "root" (p. 87); "lie" for "die" (p. 89); "than" for "then" (p. 157). Wrong references are not lacking, e.g., "6, 116" for "6, 160" (p. 90); "542" for "541" (p. 90); "164" for "166" (p. 180); line "288" for "278" (p. 194, bringing a note out of order and onto the wrong page).

More fundamental than such carelessness is the question whether for the illumination of a problem primarily archeological the appropriate form of treatment is a commentary chiefly grammatical and lexicographical written by one who has had no firsthand acquaintance with the site with which he deals (see p. 20).

ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE

Harvard University

L. Iuni Moderati Columellae opera quae exstant, Fasc. 4: *Rei rusticae libros sextum et septimum continens*. Edited by VILHELM LUNDSTRÖM. ("Collectio scriptorum veterum Upsaliensis.") Göteborg: Eranos' Forlag, 1940. Pp. vi+157. Kr. 8.

For more than a century the latest and best text of Columella's twelve books of the *Res rustica* and his single book *De arboribus* was to be found in the *Scriptores rei rusticae* (Vol. II [1794]) of J. G. Schneider, which marked an improvement on the notable edition of J. M. Gesner (1735).

A little more than forty years ago a young Swedish scholar, the late Vilhelm Lundström,¹ then at Upsala, began the publication, in the "Collectio scriptorum veterum Upsaliensis," of a much-needed recension of the Columella text, with full *apparatus criticus*, based on a thorough collation of the two best and oldest manuscripts—S (Sangermanensis Petropolitanus Leningradensis olim 207, nunc Mscr. Lat. 1, saec. IX) and A (Ambrosianus L 85 sup., saec. IX/X)—and some twenty inferior manuscripts of the fifteenth century, all closely related and designated collectively as R. The work has appeared in instalments at irregular intervals and in irregular order. The first fascicle, containing the *De arboribus*, was published at Upsala in 1897. This was fol-

¹ Professor Lundström died March 20, 1940, at the age of seventy years.

lowed by Book x of the *Res rustica* in Fascicle 6 (Upsala, 1902). Then came Book xi in Fascicle 7 (Upsala, 1906), and Books i-ii in Fascicle 2 (Göteborg, 1917). Now, after a lapse of twenty-three years, we have Books vi-vii as Fascicle 4, completed shortly before the death of Lundström.

In his last fascicle Lundström followed the same general plan as in those preceding, with the difference that his sigla and critical apparatus include the signs and readings of ten additional *deteriores* of the R-family, together with those of three earlier manuscripts—N (Paris. Lat. N. Acq. 1630, saec. XI), P (Paris. Lat. 13995, saec. XI), and M (Ambrosianus C 212 inf., saec. XIV)—containing excerpts from Books vi-vii. Added also, and especially pertinent to Book vi, dealing with the care of the larger domestic animals, are *testimonia* of Palladius (ed. Schmitt) and of the veterinary works of Pelagonius (ed. Ihm), Vegetius (ed. Lommatzsch), the *Mulomedicina Chironis* (ed. Oder), and the *Corpus hippiatricorum Graecorum* (ed. Oder and Hoppe). The sum is a remarkably complete *apparatus*, conveniently placed below the text and occupying more than half of the average page. The laborious collation of upward of forty manuscripts and editions has been done with Lundström's usual great accuracy and thoroughness, if this reviewer may judge from much checking with a few of the most important codices (in photostatic copies) and with printed editions. It may be questioned whether the collating of so large a number of closely related fifteenth-century manuscripts, about thirty of them, has benefited the text to a degree at all commensurate with the enormous amount of time and labor expended.

It is needless to say that Lundström has again rendered a great service to students of Columella. Comparison of his text with that of the eighteenth-century editions reveals, for the two books, close to five hundred important changes of reading, each of one or more words, well supported by manuscript authority. Minor differences in orthography and punctuation are numerous. Emendations bearing Lundström's *scripsi* number fifty or more, most of them plausible, a few unnecessary; and at least six accepted readings are credited to Svennung.

Inconsistencies of spelling occur, certainly caused in large measure, as in the earlier fascicles, by too great fidelity to the ninth-century S. Examples are: *incocuntur* (vi. 32.2; cf. *secuntur*, vi. 2.4) against *incoquantur* (vi. 13.1); *vivum* (vi. 12.3), *vivom* (vi. 32.3); *alvom* (vi. 4.3), *alvum* (vii. 10.6); *vulgaribus* (vi. 27.3), *volgaris* (vii. 1.1); *mirti* (vi. 4.1), *myrti* (vi. 6.4), *murti* (vi. 7.2, 3); *spongea* (vi. 9.1), *spongia* (vi. 12.4, 27.10); *coetus* (vi. 23.3), *coitum* (vi. 24.3); *hordeacia* (vi. 38.2), *hordeace-* (vi. 10.1, 2, 17.3; vii. 10.3, 12.10); *feni* (vii. 4.2), *faen-* (vi. 3.3, 30.5, 38.4; vii. 3.21), *foen-* (vi. 3.5, 6, 8); *vinacia* (vi. 3.5), *vinaceorum* (vi. 3.8, 7.4); *aspergantur* (vi. 13.3), *aspargitur* (vii. 8.4); *valvulis* (vi. 4.3, 10.1, 31.1; vii. 4.2), *valvolis* (vi. 14.2); *amurca* (vii. 4.7), *amurga* often; *linire* (vi. 17.6, 26.4), *liniuntur* (vi. 30.3), *linuntur* (vi. 27.10; cf. *linantur*, vi. 30.6, *circumlinend-*, vi. 16.3, 17.9); *perniciem* (vi. 17.5, 6), *pernitium* (vii. 5.20); *transilit* (vi. 29.1), *transsilire* (vii. 9.10); *fresae fabae* (vi. 3.5), *fresae fabae* (vii. 4.2);

maciescat (vi. 3.1), *macescat* (vii. 3.18; cf. *macescunt*, vii. 7.1). The readings *repperiri* (vii. 5.7) and *per cornum* (vi. 2.7, vii. 10.3; cf. *per cornu*, vi. 10.1 *bis*) are clearly chargeable to undue loyalty to the "best manuscript."

A few words are found which have not been recognized as yet by the lexicographers. Lundström's emendation *interaminum* (*inter/ra minum* M, *terminum* S, *torminum* edd.) in vi. 7.1 seems doubtful. The same may be said of *flaces* (SA, *flacces* R, *flocces* or *fraces* edd.; cf. *De arb.* 14, *fracibus*) in vi. 13.3. At vi. 20.1 how is one to translate *subtruncior* (SA, *subtruncior* and *substrictiore* R, *substrictior* edd.; cf. Pallad. iv. 11.4, *ventre substricto*) as a modifier of *venter*? Svennung's *clodigo* (= *claudigo*) is better than *clavi* of the older editions at vii. 5.11. The superiority of *gneci* to *cneci* (cf. *κνήκος*, safflower) in vii. 8.1 is questionable, as is the preference, in vi. 7.3, for *aprotonum* (SA, *abrotonum* or *abrotanum* R and edd., *habrotonum* M; cf. *ἄβρότονον*) *cepaticum* (Lundström, *ceraticum* SAR, *erraticum* M and edd.).

The proofreading has been done with care, and but few misprints remain. Attention may be called to *alrga* for *larga* (vii. 3.9), *longinguae* for *longinquae* (vii. 3.13), *suburbunae* for *suburbanae* (vii. 3.13). On page 89 an extraneous character, *ā*, has crept into the running title. Identifying numerals are omitted, for the most part, in the critical apparatus on page 90. On page 101 the section number 6 appears in the bold-faced type elsewhere used to indicate chapters. On page 102, chapter 3 should begin a new paragraph.

But the imperfections noted, and other minor criticisms that might be made, are insignificant in comparison with the magnitude of the task and the value of the work. We have, at last, a sound critical text of Books vi-vii. In his editions of slightly more than half of the *Columella* text, not to mention a host of other published works and his long editorship of *Eranos*, Professor Lundström has left a monument that will long endure.

H. B. ASH

University of Pennsylvania

The Roman Antiquities of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. With an English translation by EARNEST CARY, on the basis of the version of EDWARD SPELMAN. ("Loeb Classical Library.") Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann. Vol. I (1937): Pp. xlviii+553; Vol. II (1939): Pp. 532; Vol. III (1940): Pp. 387.

These first three volumes, which are to be followed by four more, bring us down exactly to the halfway point in Book vi, viz., through chapter 48. Volume III would not have been excessively long if the remaining 48 chapters of Book vi had been included; and, besides, to break off in the middle of the exciting account of the first secession of the plebs seems a bit like the technique of the serial story. Since Dr. Cary is able to make extensive use of the eighteenth-century translation by Spelman, the work is proceeding apace, in sharp contrast to its immediate predecessor, the Teubner edition by Karl Jacoby,

which took twenty years to appear and another twenty years before we got the index volume.

The portion of the scholarly world in which English is spoken has neglected Dionysius' *Roman Antiquities*. The bibliographies by Jacoby in *Philologus*, Volume XXXVI, and in the volumes of his edition seriatim list only one single item in the English language; and apparently the only American article on Dionysius (unnoticed by Jacoby) is one by Kirby Flower Smith. It is to be hoped and expected that more scholars in England and the United States will now make the acquaintance of Dionysius through the medium of Cary's edition.

The text is that of Jacoby, with no fresh collations and no new view of the relative value of the manuscripts. Cary differs occasionally from Jacoby in his theory of Dionysius' transliteration of some of the Latin and Etruscan proper names; but otherwise he offers only about half-a-dozen emendations of his own in Volumes I and III and only one in Volume II. Most of the obvious and necessary corrections were made, many of them long ago, by earlier editors and scholars, so that there is not much left to do. Cary adopts earlier emendations a little more freely than did Jacoby, so that his text diverges somewhat further from the manuscript tradition. Several good emendations by Capps appear in Volume II, and all but one were adopted by Cary. By the time Volume III was reached, Post had been added to the board of editors of the Loeb series, and a number of emendations, chiefly of a grammatical or linguistic character, were contributed by him. The remarkable diligence and minute care with which Professor Capps has executed his editorial task on these and scores of other volumes in the Loeb series is deserving of fuller recognition; and it appears likely that Professor Post will be similarly conscientious. One looks in vain for suggestions on the text by the English editors.

The translation is easy, fluent, and accurate. Spelman's translation is not available to me, but it clearly had a generally good stylistic quality, and Cary has removed the Latinisms and most of the formidably long sentences. We still find, however, a few ponderous sentences, presumably due to Spelman: one of 166 words (98 in the Greek: i. 4. 1), another of 186 (the first sentence in Book vi), and another of 205 (i. 5. 2-3). The faulty English in the last sentence on page 181 of Volume II is evidently due to an oversight.

In Book i Dionysius frequently cites lost Greek historians on the story of Aeneas and other stories down to and including Romulus. Cary's footnotes always refer us to Müller's *FHG*; but it would seem that in the case of Pherecydes, Hellanicus, Xenagoras, and Cephalon of Gergis he should at least also refer to F. Jacoby's *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. Menecrates of Xanthus, Cary assigns with a query to the fourth century B.C.; attention might here be drawn to the oversight in Pauly-Wissowa, where it is falsely stated that Christ-Schmid puts him in *das 4. nachchristl. Jhdt.*—although Dionysius quotes him! Cary also refers (I, 237, n. 7) to Müller's *FHG* for a

quotation from Aristotle; but Rose's edition of the fragments of Aristotle would be preferable.

In these correctly printed volumes, with few mistakes even in the Greek accents, the slips that I have noticed are rare: I, 71, n. 4, eighty years before the Trojan War is 1263, not 1243; II, 287, "lifted up Tarquinius," an error for "Tullius"; II, 437, "upon seeming them," i.e., "seeing."

The introduction and notes are adequate; Spelman's notes were discarded *in toto* and new ones were provided. In sum, Dionysius is making a worthy and a welcome appearance in the Loeb series. May we hope that the Loeb editors will not overlook his rhetorical works?

CLARENCE A. FORBES

University of Nebraska

Plato Latinus, Vol. I: *Meno, interprete Henrico Aristippo*. Edited by VICTOR KORDEUTER, with a preface and commentary by CARLOTTA LABOWSKY. ("Corpus Platicum medii aevi," edited by Raymond Klibansky, under the auspices of the British Academy, the Warburg Institute of London, and the International Union of Academies.) London: Warburg Institute, 1940. Pp. xxi+92. \$2.50.

In 1939 Raymond Klibansky, lecturer in medieval philosophy at Oriel College, Oxford, brought out *The Continuity of the Platonic Tradition during the Middle Ages*, a slender but important volume which initiated the publication of the "Corpus Platicum medii aevi." Since I have reviewed this work elsewhere, I will say here merely that Mr. Klibansky has succeeded in showing what has not hitherto been sufficiently realized: that Platonism, and not always a Platonism fused with Neo-Platonism, exerted an important influence on the Arabic, Byzantine, and Western worlds "from later Antiquity to the Renaissance . . . as a force continuously stimulating scientific thought, aesthetic feeling, and religious consciousness." This tradition was never completely broken, but, through translations of certain Platonic writings and quotations in classical and patristic writings, was constantly available to scholars and theologians. The documents on which an understanding of this continuous tradition must rest are not equally available to modern scholars; hence the conception of the *Corpus*, which is to present the Latin and the Arabic translations, paraphrases, and commentaries, whole works as well as fragments.

Of this ambitious project, which is under the competent direction of Mr. Klibansky and is sponsored by the British Academy, the International Union of Academies, and the Warburg Institute of London, the first part issued is the Latin translation of the *Meno* made between 1154 and 1160 by Henricus Aristippus, archdeacon of Catania and for a time chief minister of the Norman King William I of Sicily. The same translator, familiar to scholars from the studies of C. H. Haskins, made Latin versions also of the

Phaedo and of several works of Aristotle and other Greek authors. His translations from Plato were known to Roger Bacon and to the Parisian Schoolmen, as well as to Petrarch, Coluccio Salutati, and many others.

To this first printed edition of the translation of the *Meno* Carlotta Labowsky contributes a preface dealing with the translator, the date of the translation and its prologue (to a beloved friend, unknown to us, who has asked for a version of one of the dialogues), the five manuscripts (all of the fifteenth century) and their relationship (the best being Ox. Coll. Corp. Christ. 243, anno 1423), the method of the translator (which is literal, word-for-word), and the methods of the present editors. The preparation of the text has been the care chiefly of Victor Kordeuter, who includes a critical apparatus for the Latin text and another for the Greek original. From the latter it appears that the Greek manuscript used by the translator must have agreed now with one, now with another, of the manuscripts or groups of manuscripts used by Bekker, Stallbaum, and Burnet (chiefly BTW, and F), and rarely disagreed with all.¹ Whether this Latin version could be used as a *testimonium* to supplement extant Greek manuscripts, in constituting the Platonic text, seems to me doubtful; not only are the divergencies seldom important but they may sometimes indicate mere mistranslation. I may add that this conclusion is similar to the impression that I received several years ago, when a cursory examination of Leonardo Bruni's Latin translation of the *Gorgias* convinced me that his Greek manuscript was not of a different class from those represented by BTW and by F.

The chief value of the present edition will be for the medievalist and for the classical scholar whose interest in Plato extends to the Middle Ages rather than for the simon-pure classicist. In addition to the evidence which it furnishes of the fact that the Middle Ages were acquainted with the *Meno*, the translator's word-for-word method together with the two indexes (Greek-Latin and Latin-Greek) provided by the editors will throw light on the terminology used by medieval writers.

The *Meno* thus begins auspiciously a series which, it is to be hoped, circumstances will permit to go forward in due course.

WILLIAM C. GREENE

Harvard University

The Homily on the Passion by Melito Bishop of Sardis and Some Fragments of the Apocryphal Ezekiel. Edited by CAMPBELL BONNER. ("Studies and Documents," Vol. XII.) London: Christophers; Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1940.

This hitherto unknown sermon from the late second century was found in a fourth-century papyrus shared by the British Museum and the Univer-

¹ Of the same translator's Latin version of the *Phaedo*, Burnet remarks that it "was made either from [W] or from a very similar Ms."

sity of Michigan, the same papyrus book from which Professor Bonner published *The Last Chapters of Enoch*.¹ The editor's work has been done with a skill and thoroughness that have seldom been equaled. An Introduction of eighty-two pages covers both technical and general questions. The Greek text is given in both diplomatic and modern transcription with notes and is followed by a translation whose "biblical" flavor is true to the rhetoric of Melito. All students of early Christianity are deeply in Professor Bonner's debt for this splendid edition.

In both technical and general matters, few questions can be raised, aside from those raised by the editor himself. Yet the judgment that the "I am" style was "appropriate only to divinity" is a slight overstatement; surely the style was appropriate to any solemn identification and thus particularly appropriate to the identification of deity. Moreover, the opening of Paul's Epistle to the Romans deserves citation among the parallels to the sections in which Melito describes the corruption of mankind after the Fall.

Although the importance of the homily is for the most part clearly indicated by the editor, yet in one area he fails to appreciate the significance of this Good Friday sermon, i.e., in the history of early Christian theology. The theology of Melito, bishop of Sardis, is revealed as being far from orthodox. He speaks of Jesus as

born as a Son, led forth as a lamb, sacrificed as a sheep, buried as a man, he rose from the dead as God, being by nature God and man. Who is all things: in that he judges, Law, in that he teaches, Word, in that he saves, Grace, in that he begets, Father, in that he is begotten, Son, in that he suffers, a sacrificial sheep, in that he is buried, Man, in that he arises, God [secs. 8-9].

Again in his peroration on the Crucifixion (secs. 95-97), Melito identifies the Creator with Jesus: "God has been murdered, the King of Israel has been slain by an Israelitish hand." Professor Bonner tends to explain this as either naïve, unguarded speech or as emotional rhetoric and, in either case, as departure from an existing orthodoxy (pp. 28 and 19). But Melito supports Walter Bauer's thesis² that what we call "orthodoxy" was a secondary development, which originated at Rome. Melito's modalistic, patripassian theology without a true doctrine of the Holy Spirit is heretical, like all primitive Christian writing, because it antedates the formation of orthodoxy. These startling sayings are not unorthodox because they are the unguarded speech of a layman; on the contrary, they are the formal studied utterance of the "bishop" of Sardis and take their place naturally with other early—i.e., heretical—Christian writings. Their great value in this regard is that they can be dated and located and accurately assigned to a definite Christian leader.

ERNEST CADMAN COLWELL

University of Chicago

¹ Reviewed in this *Journal*, XXXIV (1939), 89 f.

² *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1934).

'Η Ἑθνικὴ Συνείδησις τοῦ Πλάτωνος. Κωνστ. Ι. Βουρβέρη. Athens, 1939. Pp. 51.

This study of the national consciousness of Plato is a protest against interpreting Plato as bridging the gulf between the Greeks and Barbarians through his concept of absolute man, above and beyond nationality. This interpretation, Vourveris points out, overlooks Plato's roots in the Greek tradition, his numerous expressions about the fundamental differences between the Greeks and Barbarians, about the Greek character of the ideal state of the *Republic*, and about the need of harmony to meet the ever present danger from the Barbarians. Plato, he claims, did not break down the barriers between Greeks and Barbarians; in seeing man he did not overlook his citizenship in the πόλις. Ever conscious of the degeneration of the Greeks of his day, Plato worked for their regeneration through a realistic idealism of life in an educating state. Vourveris has offered a good corrective to the static Plato of that scholarship which sees Plato solely *sub specie aeternitatis*.

This study presents a comprehensive survey of the problem. In the first chapter, after defining nation and national consciousness, Vourveris shows how Plato's national consciousness arises within the frame of the city-state and is concerned with a *Kulturnation* and not a *Staatnation*, which never existed among the Greeks. In the second chapter he surveys the manifestations and factors which developed national consciousness among the Greeks. In the third and final chapter he sets forth the national consciousness of Plato by weaving into a unified pattern Plato's statements on the Greeks and Barbarians.

Plato's statements on the Barbarians show no consistent point of view. If we take the statements in *Republic* 435e-436a, 470c-d, as Plato's central and consistent point of view about the Barbarians, as Vourveris does, difficulties arise. In these evaluating judgments, Plato categorically posits the Greeks and Barbarians as enemies by nature; the Greek race is φιλομαθές, whereas the Barbarians are characterized by the φιλόνηκον and φιλοκερδές. Yet in Plato there are found far more numerous statements wherein the Greeks and Barbarians are treated as equals without distinction, wherein Plato attests the learning, achievements, and civilization of the Barbarians. How are we to reconcile these conflicting views about the Barbarians with Plato's advice ἕνα περὶ ἑνὸς ἀεὶ δεῖ λόγον ἀποφαίνεσθαι (*Laws* 719d). Are these complimentary references to the Barbarians to be viewed as illustrative material out of its context and in no way affecting Plato's categorical statements in the *Republic*? Are they reflections of a Greek tradition arising from the Greeks in Asia Minor whose contact with the Barbarians made them more cognizant of the value and civilization of the Barbarians? Or is the explanation to be found in the Platonic ideal world where the λογικόν is beyond earthly contexts and where Barbarian no less than Greek can enter by virtue of the element in his soul which transcends nationalism? Vourveris here fails in σώξεν τὰ

φαινόμενα. In his use of evidence he could be more careful. On page 27 he uses the *Epinomis* as evidence of Plato's consciousness of the superiority of the Greeks over the Barbarians, yet on page 33 he refers to Philip of Opus as the author of this dialogue. Aside from such points, Vourveris' study is a contribution to the growing scholarship which does not abstract Plato or his thought from the historical perspective of his own time.

Trinity College
Hartford

JAMES A. NOTOPOULOS

Warming Both Hands: The Autobiography of Henry Rushton Fairclough, Including His Experiences under the American Red Cross in Switzerland and Montenegro. Foreword by RAY LYMAN WILBUR. Stanford University, Calif.: Stanford University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1941. Pp. xvi+629. \$3.75.

"I believe," says Dr. Wilbur in his preface, "that this book will have a wide appeal." His belief is not unreasonable, for, as the title itself indicates, the late Professor Fairclough's interests and activities were not confined to classical philology. He was a devout Churchman, an enthusiastic sportsman, and a lover of music, art, and nature. He was acquainted with many people who were prominent in various fields, and not a few of them were his steadfast friends.

His autobiography faithfully reflects his many-sidedness. Thus in the very first chapter one is surprised to learn that at the age of eleven, tiring of school, he became a druggist's apprentice and, after three years, won a diploma in pharmacy. Hoping, however, to become a physician and realizing his need for further academic training, he resumed his studies, but with results which he did not then anticipate. "I realized for almost the first time," he says (p. 14), "how deeply great poetry can stir the heart. It was the *Sixth Iliad* and the *Second Aeneid* that determined my later career."

The story of this career as an interpreter of Greek and Latin literature forms the main theme of the rest of the book. In explaining the circumstances which gave rise to his technical publications—a scholar's chief claim to fame—he seems to keep the general reader in mind. Assuming (quite justly perhaps) that such a reader knows almost nothing of the problems involved, he patiently sets forth the background and reduces the philological argumentation to a minimum. Doubtless this absence of scholarly controversy makes the book easier reading for the average person, but for anyone who is familiar with the problems it detracts from the interest of the narrative. Did the course of a philologist ever run so smooth? One misses the terse, incisive criticism of self and of others which makes, let us say, the *Erinnerungen* of Wilamowitz so vivid and absorbing.

"I am very fond," he confesses (p. 531), "of looking over genealogical records." But long before the reader has arrived at this point, he is fully aware of the author's tendency to overload his pages with such *personalia*. We learn the names and history not only of *his* friends and relatives but of *their* friends and relatives until we cry "Quo usque?" Such details make the book a mine of information for those who are interested in the political and cultural history of Canada, the history of Stanford University, the growth of the Episcopal Church in California, and a dozen other topics; still, one cannot but feel that, if many of them had been ruthlessly deleted, there would be fewer pages which resemble *Who's Who*.

When the author shakes off this antiquarian tendency, he writes colorfully and entertainingly, as he does in much of his account of his undergraduate days, in his description of the California earthquake and of his service with the Red Cross in World War I, and on many other pages. Occasionally he gives his opinions on such matters as coeducation, junior colleges, the value of alternating work and study, the maintenance of separate departments of Greek and Latin, the League of Nations, and the World Court. One regrets that he did not devote more of his space to these topics, since his training and experience well qualified him to deal with many of them.

JOHN P. COOKE

University of Chicago

Hunting Scenes on Roman Glass in the Rhineland. By MICHAEL GINSBURG. ("University of Nebraska Studies," Vol. XLI, No. 2.) Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1941. Pp. 31. \$0.75.

In this study the author begins with a brief historical and technical account of Roman glass in the Rhineland, which means chiefly at Cologne, and then proceeds "to examine one group of these vessels—those showing hunting scenes—to see to what extent they complete our knowledge of hunting in Ancient Rome." Twelve pieces are illustrated and discussed. Apparently, most or all have been published before, but not in places readily accessible to classicists. The hunting of hares, deer, boars, and bears is pleasantly described, with use of various sources besides the glass. One misses a reference to Rodenwaldt's article, "Vertragus" (*Jahrb. d. Deutschen Archäol. Inst.*, XLVIII [1933], 204–25). Mr. Ginsburg rightly stresses the interest of Rhineland glass, which was at its best in the early part of the third century, and the further studies that he promises will be welcome.

F. P. JOHNSON

University of Chicago

BOOKS RECEIVED

[Not all works submitted can be reviewed, but those that are sent to the editorial office for notice are regularly listed under "Books Received." Books submitted are not returnable.]

- ANDERSON, F. H. *Bacon on Platonism*. (Reprinted from the *University of Toronto Quarterly*, XI, No. 2 [January, 1942], 154-66.)
- ASH, HARRISON BOYD (ed. and trans.). *Lucius Junius Moderatus Columella, "On Agriculture": With a Recension of the Text and an English Translation by Harrison Boyd Ash*, Vol. I: *Res rustica i-iv*. ("Loeb Classical Library.") 3 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1941. Pp. xxx+461. Cloth, \$2.50; leather, \$3.50.
- BODKIN, MAUD. *The Quest for Salvation in an Ancient and a Modern Play*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1941. Pp. 54. \$0.85.
- BOËTHIUS, AXEL. *Roman Architecture from Its Classicistic to Its Late Imperial Phase*. ("Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift," Vol. XLVII [1941:8].) Göteborg: Elanders Boktryckeri Aktiebolag, 1941. Pp. 33+8 figs. Kr. 5.
- COLSON, F. H. (trans.). *Philo: With an English Translation by F. H. Colson*, Vol. IX. ("Loeb Classical Library.") 10 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1941. Pp. x+547. Cloth, \$2.50; leather, \$3.50.
- DOWDELL, VICTOR LYLE. *Aristotle and Anglican Religious Thought*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1942. Pp. xii+103. \$1.50.
- EWALD, SISTER MARIE LIGUORI. *Ovid in the Contra Oratorem Symmachii of Prudentius*. (Dissertation, Catholic University of America.) ("Catholic University of America Patristic Studies," Vol. 66.) Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1942. Pp. xiv+220.
- FLETCHER, SIR FRANK (ed.). *Virgil Aeneid VI*. Edited with Introduction and Commentary by Sir Frank Fletcher. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941. Pp. xxxii+111. \$1.25.
- FORBES, CLARENCE A. *Teachers' Pay in Ancient Greece*. ("University of Nebraska Studies" ["Studies in the Humanities," No. 2 (May, 1942)].) Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1942. Pp. 60. \$0.75.
- HATCHER, ANNA GRANVILLE. *Reflexive Verbs: Latin, Old French, Modern French*. ("The Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages," Vol. XLIII.) Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press; London: Oxford University Press; Paris: Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1942. Pp. 213. \$1.25.
- HENNES, WILLIAM R., S.J., and ARNOLD, RICHARD E., S.J. *Iris: A Reading List of Articles Selected from Classical Periodicals*. St. Louis, Mo.: Saint Louis University Book Store (221 N. Grand Blvd.), 1942. Planographed on looseleaf sheets, \$1.70; with cloth-covered board binder, \$1.95.
- Hermathena*, No. LIX (May, 1942). Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co.; London: Longmans, Green & Co. 3s.

- HOLMBERG, ERIK J. *A Doric Temple Near Asea in Arcadia*. ("Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift," Vol. XLVII [1941:13].) Göteborg: Elanders Boktryckeri Aktiebolag, 1941. Pp. 25. Kr. 3:50.
- KLEBERG, TÖNNES. *Catalogus codicum Graecorum et Latinorum bibliothecae Gotoburgensis*. Göteborg: Elanders Boktryckeri Aktiebolag, 1941. Pp. vi+48+6 figs.
- LATTIMORE, RICHMOND. *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs*. ("Illinois Studies in Language and Literature," Vol. XXVIII, Nos. 1 and 2.) Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1942. Pp. 354. Paper, \$3.00; cloth, \$3.50.
- LEHMANN-HARTLEBEN, KARL, and OLSEN, ERLING C. *Dionysiac Sarcophagi in Baltimore*. (Published jointly by the Institute of Fine Arts, New York University, and the Trustees of the Walters Art Gallery.) Baltimore, 1942. Pp. 82+44 figs.
- MERLAN, PHILIPP. *Platons Form der philosophischen Mitteilung*. (Hermäon, fasc. 10.) Leopoli, 1939. Pp. 25. 2 fr. Helv.
- OLMSTEAD, A. T. *Jesus in the Light of History*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1942. Pp. xvi+317. \$2.75.
- OWEN, E. T. *The Drama of the Agamemnon*. (Reprinted from the *University of Toronto Quarterly*, XI, No. 2 [January, 1942], 140-53.)
- PRENTICE, WILLIAM KELLY. *Those Ancient Dramas Called Tragedies*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1942. Pp. viii+194. \$2.50.
- PRITCHARD, JOHN PAUL. *Return to the Fountains: Some Classical Sources of American Criticism*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1942. Pp. xiv+271. \$3.00.
- RENARD, MARCEL. *Initiation à l'Etruscologie*. ("Collection Lebègue," No. 6.) Bruxelles: Office de publicité (36, Rue Neuve), 1941. Pp. 93+14 pls.
- ROBINSON, DAVID M. (ed.). *Excavations at Olynthus, Part XI: Necrolynthia, A Study in Greek Burial Customs and Anthropology*. By David M. Robinson, with the assistance of Frank P. Albright and with an Appendix on "Skeletons Excavated at Olynthus" by John Lawrence Angel. ("The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology," No. 32.) Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1942. Pp. xxviii+279+71 pls. \$15.
- Studies in Honor of Frederick W. Shipley by His Colleagues*. ("Washington University Studies" [new ser.], "Language and Literature," No. 14.) St. Louis, 1942. Pp. xii+314.
- THOMAS, IVOR (ed. and trans.). *Selections Illustrating the History of Greek Mathematics: with an English Translation by Ivor Thomas*, Vol. II: *From Aristarchus to Pappus*. ("Loeb Classical Library.") 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1941. Pp. xii+683. Cloth, \$2.50; leather, \$3.50.
- UNION ACADÉMIQUE INTERNATIONALE. *Corpus vasorum antiquorum*. United States of America, fasc. 8: *Fogg Museum and Gallatin Collection*. By George H. Chase and Mary Zelia Pease. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1942. Pp. 116+64 pls.
- WEBSTER, T. B. L. *Greek Interpretations*. ("Publications of the University of Manchester," No. CCLXXIX ["Classical Series," No. V].) Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1942. Pp. viii+128+8 pls. 5s. net.

INDEX TO VOLUME XXXVII

- Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 744-49, discussed **263**; *ibid.* 1035-39, discussed **264**; *ibid.* 1323-26, discussed **266**; *Choephoroi* 286-90, discussed **267**; *Persae*, note on 425; the lost *Philocletes* **38**
- afterlife, Horace's view of **275**
- ἀμβροτος, note on **77**
- Ἀνδρέας δεκάπρωτος **145**
- Anthimus *De observatione ciborum*, discussed **150**
- Ἀπόλλων κύκνος **353**
- Ἀφῆλιξ **146**
- Aristophanes, three-word iambic trimeters in **194**
- Aristotle, *Poetics* 1458 b 12, discussed **195**
- Athens, history 311, **371**
- Book Reviews (see also reviewers):
- Bloch: *I Bolli laterizi e la storia edilizia romana: contributi all'archeologia e alla storia romana* (Boëthius) **328**
- Bonner (ed.): *The Homily on the Passion by Melito Bishop of Sardis and Some Fragments of the Apocryphal Ezekiel* (Colwell) **458**
- Bourbère: Ἡ Ἑθνική Συνείδησις τοῦ Παύλου (Notopoulos) **460**
- Brommer: ΕΙΔΟΣ et ΙΔΕΑ: *Etude sémantique et chronologique des œuvres de Platon* (De Lacy) **347**
- Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray (eds.): *The Old Testament in Greek According to the Text of Codex Vaticanus, Supplemented from Other Uncial Manuscripts, with a Critical Apparatus Containing the Variants of the Chief Ancient Authorities for the Text of the Septuagint*, Vol. III, Part I: *Esther, Judith, Tobit* (Colwell) **350**
- Buck: *A Chronology of the Plays of Plautus* (Hough) **345**
- Carcopino: *Daily Life in Ancient Rome: The People and the City at the Height of the Empire* (Eng. trans. by E. O. Lorimer) (Laing) **101**
- : *La Vie quotidienne à Rome à l'apogée de l'empire* (Laing) **99**
- Carroll: *The Clausulae in the Confessions of St. Augustine* (Clark) **110**
- Cary (trans.): *The Roman Antiquities of Dionysius of Halicarnassus* (Forbes) **455**
- Cary and Haahrhoff: *Life and Thought in the Greek and Roman World* (Larsen) **231**
- Chase and Phillips: *A New Introduction to Greek* (Eller) **235**
- Delatte (ed.): *Anecdota Atheniensia et alia*, Tome II: *Textes grecs relatifs à l'histoire des sciences* (Robbins) **103**
- Devoto: *Storia della lingua di Roma* (Bonfante) **84**
- Evelyn White and Oliver: *The Temple of Hibis in El Khargeh Oasis*, Part II: *Greek Inscriptions* (Reinmuth) **445**
- Fairclough: *Warming Both Hands: The Autobiography of Henry Rush-ton Fairclough, Including His Experiences under the American Red Cross in Switzerland and Montenegro* (Cooke) **461**
- Ginsburg: *Hunting Scenes on Roman Glass in the Rhineland* (Johnson) **462**
- Goldschmidt: *Paulinus' Churches at Nola: Texts, Translations, and Commentary* (Pease) **451**
- Grace: *Archaic Sculpture in Boeotia* (Johnson) **221**

- Hanfmann: *The Etruscans and Their Art* (Johnson) **108**
- Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, Supplementary Vol. I: *Athenian Studies Presented to William Scott Ferguson* (Dorjahn) **441**
- Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, Vol. LI (Dorjahn) **441**
- Hausrath (ed.): *Corpus fabularum Aesopiarum*, Vol. I, fasc. 1 (Perry) **207**
- Hunt, Smyly, and Edgar (eds.): *The Tebtunis Papyri*, Vol. III, Part II (Pearl) **225**
- Jaeger: *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture* (Hack) **197**
- Kirk: *Fire in the Cosmological Speculations of Heracleitus* (Minar) **237**
- Kitto: *Greek Tragedy* (Smith) **107**
- Kordeuter (ed.): *Plato Latinus*, Vol. I: *Meno, interprete Henrico Aristippo* (Greene) **457**
- Liddell, Scott, Jones: *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Part 10 (Whatmough) **96**
- Linforth: *The Arts of Orpheus* (King) **339**
- Lundström (ed.): *L. Iuni Moderati Columellae opera quae exstant*, fasc. 4: *Rei rusticae libros sextum et septimum continens* (Ash) **453**
- Machado: *Questoes de gramática latina* (Roditi) **351**
- Macurdy: *The Quality of Mercy: The Gentler Virtues in Greek Literature* (Greene) **227**
- Martienssen: *Greek Cities* (Johnson) **238**
- Meritt: *Epigraphica Attica* (Dow) **323**
- Michell: *The Economics of Ancient Greece* (Blake) **232**
- Milne and Skeat: *Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus* (Lake) **91**
- Murray: *Aeschylus: The Creator of Tragedy* (Smith) **234**
- Norden: *Aus altrömischen Priesterbüchern* (Nock) **88**
- Norlin: *Things in the Saddle* (Miller) **342**
- Page (ed.): *Euripides: Medea* (Bonner) **335**
- Petropoulos (ed.): *Papyri societatis archaeologicae Atheniensis* (Westermann) **102**
- Pöstgens: *Tibulls Ambarvalgedicht* (II, i) (Ferguson) **105**
- von Premerstein: *Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der giessener Universitätsbibliothek*, V: *Ein neues Bruchstück der sogenannten alexandrinischen Märtyrer-Akten*. P. bibl. Univ. Giss. 46 (Colwell) **110**
- Radermacher: *Mythos und Sage bei den Griechen* (Bonner) **218**
- Richter: *Handbook of the Etruscan Collection* (Johnson) **108**
- Robinson: *Freedom of Speech in the Roman Republic* (Forbes) **233**
- Rostovtzeff, Brown, and Welles (eds.): *The Excavations at Dura-Europos Conducted by Yale University and the French Academy of Inscriptions and Letters. Preliminary Report of the Seventh and Eighth Seasons of Work, 1933-34 and 1934-35* (Debevoise) **349**
- Shepard: *The Fish-tailed Monster in Greek and Etruscan Art* (Johnson) **109**
- Sherwin-White: *The Roman Citizenship* (McFayden) **82**
- Slaughter: *Calabria: The First Italy* (Coulter) **223**
- Smith: *The Genuineness of the Ninth and Third Letters of Isocrates* (Laistner) **230**
- Sutherland: *The Romans in Spain, 217 B.C.—A.D. 117* (Van Nostrand) **111**
- Thompson: *Ancient Libraries* (Laistner) **229**

- Thomson: *Aeschylus and Athens* (Norwood) **437**
- Vilhelmson: *Laktanz und die Kosmogonie des spätantiken Synkretismus* (Nock) **448**
- Warmington (ed. and trans.): *Remains of Old Latin*, Vol. IV: *Archaic Inscriptions* (Whatmough) **337**
- Westermann, Keyes, and Liebesny (eds.): *Zenon Papyri: Business Papers of the Third Century B.C., Dealing with Palestine and Egypt*, Vol. II (Welles) **432**
- Willoughby and Colwell: *The Elizabeth Day McCormick Apocalypse* (Morey) **106**
- books received **112, 239, 352, 463**
- caesura*, in Latin verse **22**
- Carus, birthplace **193**
- Ciris*, vss. 66-67, discussed **191**; vss. 247-49, discussed **192**; vss. 407-8, discussed **192**
- classical scholarship, aids to **196**
- Codex Sinaiticus **429**
- comedy, Roman **1**
- Dies, leader of anti-Roman party in Athens **311**
- Etruscan language, inscriptions **431**
- Euripides, the lost *Philoctetes* **38**
- Greek epigraphy **317, 371**; Kaaba inscription **245, 403**
- Greek law **113**
- Greek tragedy, parodies of **194**
- Homer, text of **299**
- Horace, *Carm.* i. 1. 1, discussed **79**; *Ep.* i. 1. 38, discussed **80**; his mother **385**; his view of the afterlife **275**
- Inscriptiones Graecae*, II², 2839+2844 **317**
- Latin versification **22**
- Leda **363**
- legal procedure, Spartan **113**
- Maecenas, ancestry of **79**
- Manilius i. 431-42, discussed **187**
- Martial viii. 18. 5, discussed **322**
- monologues, in Roman comedy **1**
- Near East, history of **241, 398**
- ornamenta triumphalia*, origin of **130**
- ostraca, O. Mich. I, 151 **142**; I, 180 **144**; I, 308 **144**; I, 664 **147**; I, 656 **148**
- papyri, Homeric **299**
- Pericles, Sophoclean allusion to **306**
- Petronius 62. 9 f., discussed **319**
- Phaëthon **353**
- Phrynichus, *Phoenissae*, note on **425**
- Pindar, *Nemean* 1. 64 ff., discussed **428**
- πλαστική, meaning of **267**
- Plato, *Parmenides*, analysis of **50, 159**; doctrine of ideas of, discussed **288**
- pontifex maximus*, election of, in late Roman Republic **421**
- religion, Greek **353**; Roman; see Roman religion
- reviewers:
- Ash, H. B. **453**
- Blake, Robert P. **232**
- Boëthius, Axel **328**
- Bonfante, G. **84**
- Bonner, Campbell **218, 335**
- Clark, Charles Upson **110**
- Colwell, Ernest Cadman **110, 350, 458**
- Cooke, John P. **461**
- Coulter, Cornelia C. **223**
- Debevoise, Neilson C. **349**
- De Lacy, Phillip **347**
- Dorjahn, Alfred P. **441**
- Dow, Sterling **323**
- Eller, Henry M. **235**
- Ferguson, Alice Catherine **106**
- Forbes, Clarence A. **233, 455**
- Greene, William C. **227, 457**
- Hack, R. K. **197**
- Hough, John N. **345**
- Johnson, F. P. **108, 109, 221, 238, 462**
- King, Donald **339**

- Laing, Gordon J. 99, 101
Laistner, M. L. W. 229, 230
Lake, Kirsopp 91
Larsen, J. A. O. 231
McFayden, Donald 82
Miller, Walter 342
Minar, Edwin L., Jr. 237
Morey, C. R. 106
Nock, Arthur Darby 88, 448
Norwood, Gilbert 437
Notopoulos, James A. 460
Pearl, O. M. 225
Pease, Arthur S. 451
Perry, B. E. 207
Reinmuth, O. W. 445
Robbins, Frank E. 103
Roditi, Edouard 351
Smith, Gertrude 107, 234
Van Nostrand, J. J. 111
Welles, C. Bradford 432
Westermann, William Linn 102
Whatmough, J. 96, 337
Roman comedy, use of exit monologues in 1
Roman Empire, history of 193, 241, 398
Roman religion 275, 421
Roman Republic, history of 421; relations of, with Athens 311
Sasanid history 241, 398
Sibyl, Sibylline Books 249, 398
Sophocles, *Oedipus Rex* 863-910, discussed 307; *Philoctetes* 38
Sparta, administration of justice in 113
Thucydides, son of Melesias, Sophoclean allusion to 307
tribute lists, Athenian 371
Vergil. See *Ciris*
verna, meaning of 314

OCT 19 1942

VOLUME XXXVII

NUMBER 4

October 1942

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

A Quarterly Journal devoted to re-
search in the Languages, Literatures,
History, and Life of Classical Antiquity

THE UNIVERSITY *of* CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

EDITORS

CHARLES HENRY BEESON
ROBERT JOHNSON BONNER
BLANCHE BEATRICE BOYER
CARL DARLING BUCK

JAKOB A. O. LARSEN, *Managing Editor*
FRANKLIN P. JOHNSON
GORDON JENNINGS LAING
RICHARD P. McKEON

HENRY W. PRESCOTT
GERTRUDE SMITH
BERTHOLD LOUIS ULLMAN

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

CAMPBELL BONNER, *University of Michigan*
GEORGE LINCOLN HENDRICKSON, *Yale University*
WERNER JAEGER, *Harvard University*

ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE, *Harvard University*
JOHN C. ROLFE, *University of Pennsylvania*
KENNETH SCOTT, *Western Reserve University*

ANDREW FLEMING WEST, *Princeton University*

VOL. XXXVII

CONTENTS FOR OCTOBER 1942

No. 4

ΑΠΟΛΑΩΝ ΚΤΚΝΟΣ	Alexander H. Krappe	353
Studies in the Athenian Tribute Lists. I	Sterling Dow	371
The Enigma of Horace's Mother	William Hardy Alexander	385
The Mid-third Century of the Christian Era. II	A. T. Olmstead	398
Notes and Discussions		421
<p>LILY ROSS TAYLOR: The Election of the <i>pontifex maximus</i> in the Late Republic.—EUGENE O'NEILL, JR.: Note on Phrynichus' <i>Phoenissae</i> and Aeschylus' <i>Persae</i>.—GILBERT NORWOOD: Pindar Nemean 1. 64 ff.—H. IDRIS BELL: A Reply.—J. WHATMOUGH: Two Etruscan Inscriptions.</p>		
Book Reviews		432
<p>WILLIAM LINN WESTERMANN, CLINTON WALKER KEYES, AND HERBERT LIEBERNY (eds.): <i>Zenon Papyri: Business Papers of the Third Century B.C. Dealing with Palestine and Egypt</i> (Welles).—GEORGE THOMSON: <i>Aeschylus and Athens</i> (Norwood).—<i>Harvard Studies in Classical Philology</i>, Vol. LI; <i>Harvard Studies in Classical Philology</i>, Supplementary Vol. I: <i>Athenian Studies Presented to William Scott Ferguson</i> (Dorjahn).—H. G. EVELYN WHITE AND JAMES H. OLIVER: <i>The Temple of Hibis in El Khargeh Oasis, Part II: Greek Inscriptions</i> (Reinmuth).—KONSTANTIN VILHELMSON: <i>Laktans und die Kosmogonie des spätantiken Synkretismus</i> (Nock).—R. C. GOLDSCHMIDT: <i>Paulinus' Churches at Nola: Texts, Translations, and Commentary</i> (Pease).—VILHELM LUNDSTRÖM (ed.): <i>L. Iuni Moderati Columellae opera quae exstant</i>, Fasc. 4: <i>Rei rusticae libros sextum et septimum continens</i> (Ash).—EARNEST CARY (trans.): <i>The Roman Antiquities of Dionysius of Halicarnassus</i> (Forbes).—VICTOR KORDEUTER (ed.): <i>Plato Latinus</i>, Vol. I: <i>Meno, interprete Henrico Aristippo</i> (Greene).—CAMPBELL BONNER (ed.): <i>The Homily on the Passion by Melito Bishop of Sardis and Some Fragments of the Apocryphal Ezekiel</i> (Colwell).—CONST. I. VOYVÈRE: 'H Έδρα της Ευαγγελίας του Παύλου (Notopoulos).—HENRY RUSHTON FAIRCLOUGH: <i>Warming Both Hands: The Autobiography of Henry Rushton Fairclough, Including His Experiences under the American Red Cross in Switzerland and Montenegro</i> (Cooke).—MICHAEL GINSBURG: <i>Hunting Scenes on Roman Glass in the Rhineland</i> (Johnson).</p>		
Books Received.		463
Index to Volume XXXVII		465

Classical Philology is published quarterly in the months of January, April, July, and October, by the University of Chicago at the University of Chicago Press, 5750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. ¶ The subscription price is \$4.00 per year; the price of single copies is \$1.25. Orders for service of less than a full year will be charged at the single-copy rate. ¶ Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States and its possessions, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Republic of Honduras, Mexico, Morocco (Spanish Zone), Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Rio de Oro, El Salvador, Spain (including Balearic Islands, Canary Islands, and the Spanish Offices in Northern Africa; Andorra), Spanish Guinea, Uruguay, and Venezuela. ¶ Postage is charged extra as follows: For Canada and Newfoundland, 16 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$4.16), on single copies, 4 cents (total \$1.29); for all other countries in the Postal Union 40 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$4.40), on single copies, 10 cents (total \$1.35). ¶ Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to the University of Chicago Press in United States currency or its equivalent by postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following are authorized agents:

For the British Empire, except North America, India, and Australasia: THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Bentley House, 200 Euston Road, London, N.W. 1, England. Prices of yearly subscriptions and of single copies may be had on application.

Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit.

Business correspondence should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.

Communications for the editors and manuscripts, which must be typewritten, should be addressed to the Editor of CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

The articles in this journal are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York, N.Y.

Applications for permission to quote from this journal should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, and will be freely granted.

Entered as second-class matter July 5, 1906, at the post-office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in United States Postal Act of October 3, 1917, Section 1103, amended February 28, 1925, authorized June 6, 1918.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.



ZEUS: A Study in Ancient Religion

by A. B. Cook

Professor Cook has completed his monumental work of half a lifetime devoted to the fullest examination of the Greek worship of Zeus. "*A veritable cyclopedia of ancient religion. The acquaintance with the pertinent literature displayed in the notes is truly astounding.*"—The Classical Weekly. "*A lifetime's meat and drink for the classical archaeologist.*"—The Westminster Gazette. "*Its magnificent illustrations, its wealth of learning and suggestions, and the splendid format should restore many a student's faith in life.*"—Arthur Darby Nock.

3 Volumes, 3,700 pages, \$82.00

THE MYSTICAL PHILOSOPHY OF MUḤYID DÍN-IBNUL 'ARABÍ

by A. E. Affifi

The philosophical system of Ibnul 'Arabí is the key to nearly all Moslem religious philosophy since the thirteenth century. This is the first book to attempt a complete exposition of the whole system.

\$3.40

THE RECOVERY OF THE ANCIENT HEBREW LANGUAGE

by D. W. Thomas

The Old Testament is only a small part of an extensive ancient Hebrew literature of which the rest is lost. Professor Thomas discusses the problem of reconstructing that literature and language and suggests various lines of research.

60 cents

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

60 Fifth Avenue, New York

Coming in October ~

By **LAURENCE LEE HOWE**

THE PRETORIAN PREFECT FROM COMMODUS TO DIOCLETIAN (A.D. 180-305)

The pretorian prefecture, founded by Augustus as the office of commander of the imperial bodyguards, came in the third century to combine the positions of minister-of-war, generalissimo of the armies, chief justice of the court of appeals, and general vice-emperor. Then, under Constantine, the position was deprived of all military functions and the prefects became judicial and administrative officials.

Legal historians have supposed that, during the third century, jurists replaced soldiers in the prefecture, so that Constantine merely regularized the existing situation in making it a purely civil office; but recent work has shown that the great majority of the mid-third-century prefects were soldiers.

This book seeks to piece together the story of the development of the office during the period of its greatest importance. It offers evidence to show that the pretorian prefecture was not changed overnight by any emperor, but underwent a regular and natural course of development, shaped by the necessities rising out of the general political history of the third century. Throws new light on a number of events in the narrative history of the period. \$2.00

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

Aeschylus: *Prometheus Bound*

Sophocles: *Oedipus the King*

Euripides: *Hippolytus*

Three Greek Tragedies in Translation

By **DAVID GRENE**, *Department of Greek, The University of Chicago*

These translations are unusually successful in their fidelity, naturalness, grace, and strength. They do not attempt to imitate the traditional language of English dramatic poetry. Their modern phrasing, irregular line-length, and accentuation are well suited both to the dialogue and to the choral passages.

In the introductory essays, the author avoids routine information on the Greek theater or the plays under consideration, but selects for treatment matters of genuine interest to the student or reader, handling them with fresh insight.

Trade edition \$2.50; Text edition \$1.75

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

